

Trump Wants Peace with Russia but Must Battle His Own Party & Avoid Impeachment

[New Era World News and Global Intelligence](#)

FOLLOWING PRESIDENT TRUMP'S November 11, 2017 exchange with Russian President Vladimir Putin, the US Commander in Chief seems to have recalled his election promises to seek friendly cooperation with Russia necessary to defeat terrorism and bolster chances for world peace thereby signaling a personal decision to take more vigorous control of his office, to more firmly exercise his executive powers and to more resolutely direct foreign affairs. If he fails to do so and continues to let himself get browbeat by Congress, he risks looking like an impotent "lame duck" to his executive peers in the international arena.

Pursuant to his impromptu conversation with Putin, President Trump declared ([CNN Nov. 12, 2017](#)):

*"We have to get to work to solve Syria, to solve North Korea, to solve Ukraine, to solve terrorism... People don't realize Russia has been very, very heavily sanctioned. They were sanctioned at a very high level, and that took place very recently. **It's now time to get back to healing a world that is shattered and broken.**"*

To secure peace and healing for a broken and shattered world requires that the United States first establish peace with Russia. Thus, [Newsweek \(Nov 12, 2017\)](#) also recorded the president advocating friendly terms with Russia:

"I feel that having Russia in a friendly posture, as opposed to always fighting with them, is an asset to the world and an

asset to our country, not a liability.”

President Trump has indicated that the way forward is to show good will and a prudential amount of trust for the Russian leadership. Wanting to take the high road, and act as the bigger man, the president indicated his willingness to take the necessary first steps forward by hinting at reducing the impact of sanctions recently imposed by the US Congress and by offering his hand in trust to the Russian President. Referring to the accusation that President Putin interfered in the US Presidential Election, Trump revealed his willingness to extend a modicum of trust to his Russian peer:

*“Every time he sees me he says, ‘I didn’t do that,’ and **I really believe that when he tells me that, he means it,**” Trump told reporters. “I think he is very insulted by it.”*

Yes, President Putin is insulted, very insulted and perplexed. Thus according to the Russian President:

“Relations between the United States and Russia are at a ‘state of crisis’” (Video 2:41-2:46).

Relations are at a “state of crisis” because Congress under the influence of Neocon war hawks and liberal democrats are interfering with the president’s ability to engage productively in foreign affairs. Unable to fend them off, the president reluctantly agreed to enforce a new round of sanctions recently imposed by Congress. However, President Trump noted that Congress has blatantly interfered with his powers as Chief Executive, thereby insulting him. According to the new Congressional Legislation the president is *not*

permitted to amend or lift any of the provisions imposed by Congress without Congressional approval (see video below 40 sec – 1:00) Thus, the [New York Times](#), reported that President Trump is not satisfied with the Congressional sanctions and might ignore them. According to Mr. Trump, the congressional legislation contains:

“‘...Clearly unconstitutional provisions.’” Thereby leaving *“open the possibility that he might choose not to enforce them as lawmakers intended.”*

The president's ire was also reported by [NBC News](#) who recorded his telling words:

“The Framers of our Constitution put foreign affairs in the hands of the President. This bill will prove the wisdom of that choice.”

According to [Radio Liberty](#), Russian Prime Minister Dmitry Medvedev rejoined:

“‘The hope for improving our relations with the new U.S. administration is now over,’ after Trump reluctantly signed the bill he once opposed, calling it “significantly flawed” and signaling that he might not fully implement the sanctions....’Trump’s administration has demonstrated total impotence by surrendering its executive authority to Congress in the most humiliating way,’ Medvedev said adding; ‘The American establishment has won an overwhelming victory over Trump. The president wasn’t happy with the new sanctions, but he had to sign the bill.’”

Prime Minister Medvedev seemed totally surprised at the ability of Congress to tie an American President's hands:

“The U.S. establishment has fully outwitted Trump – the president is not happy about the new sanctions, yet he could not but sign the bill,” he added. “New steps are to come, and they will ultimately aim to remove him from power” ([NBC News](#)).

Nonetheless, for these sanctions to be successful, the President as the Executive arm of government must be willing to enforce them. His threat *not* to do so is *not* without precedent; he could always pull an Andrew Jackson and refuse.



President Trump in the Oval Office with Picture of President Andrew Jackson Conspicuously Hovering over His Executive Desk

Andrew Jackson and The Trail of Tears

Andrew Jackson, Trump’s esteemed predecessor, was caught up in a similar political imbroglio that involved the removal of Cherokee Indians from their native lands in Georgia onto

reservations located on the westbank of the Mississippi River. Jackson displayed his Executive Power by ignoring a Supreme Court ruling in a historic move that became known as the "Trail of Tears". The State of Georgia claimed it had rights to the lands inhabited by the Cherokees. The Cherokee Indians, on the other hand, argued that the land was private property belonging to them and therefore could not be legally alienated. The Supreme Court ruled in favor of the Cherokee, the land was theirs and they could stay on it.. The court's decision, however, meant little without the executive arm of the President to enforce it. President Jackson favored moving the Indians westward into the Oklahoma Territory and therefore opposed Chief Justice John Marshall's decision. When the decision came across Jackson's desk he vehemently uttered his famous landmark words:

"Mr. Marshall has made his decision. Now let him enforce it!"

In other words, "Tough s-t; This decision means nothing if unbacked by the my Executive arm." The indians were forcibly removed to Oklahoma.

As much as President Trump might admire the strong arm abilities of his nineteenth century predecessor, it is doubted that he will resort to Jacksonian politics. Mr. Trump will most likely have to find an alternative route to normalize relations with Russia thereby obtaining his desire for a significantly amended foreign policy emphasizing cooperative relations with the Kremlin as a means toward world peace. One possible route toward this end involves winning support in the upcoming (Nov 2018) Congressional elections.

If Mr. Trump lacks congressional support (as he currently does), and likewise chooses *not* to enforce the sanctions of the Congressional Act that imposes, *against his will*, additional stringent sanctions on Russia, if he chooses to refrain from enforcing these sanctions, he will surely spark

legitimate flames intended to immolate his presidency by impeachment. Nonetheless, a man like President Trump, a man used to careful calculations related to getting it his way, a man such as this, might be willing to risk impeachment if he has enough pull in the Senate – This maneuver is also with precedent: [President Clinton was impeached by the House but acquitted in the Senate](#). Moreover, **there was plenty of animus to impeach Andrew Jackson but the House could never muster enough votes necessary to make it happen.** The Republicans currently hold majorities in both the House and the Senate; depending upon how the upcoming Congressional Elections turnout, President Trump might be willing to risk impeachment and avoid acquittal.

Facing the Intelligence Community – Neocon Warhawks and their Liberal Allies

With impeachment looming in the background and lacking necessary support from his own Intelligence Community, Mr Trump is facing an uphill battle, a battle that will require an adroit foreign policy maneuver, one which carries unusual risks. The risks are unusual because President Trump is in an unusually weak position *vis a vis* many members in his own party in addition to stiff opposition from the American Intelligence Community which, based upon paltry, some would say, non-existent, evidence continues to rally against and demonize Russia.

Despite all the verbose and daily rhetoric about Russia hacking American elections, **the best US Intel has come up with (so far) is to blame Russian news outlets such as Sputnik and RT for writing articles that offer a contrary perspective than that put forward by CNN and other US agencies.** Russia does have its propaganda mouthpieces and Sputnik and RT appear to be in the forefront of their propaganda efforts; nonetheless, **the US also has its propaganda outlets such as [Foreign Policy](#), [Foreign Affairs](#), [Radio Free Europe](#) and [Radio](#)**

[Liberty](#), to name a few, all operating on foreign soil under the penumbra of 'Freedom of the Press". Thus, if the US wants to charge Russia with interference by Sputnik and RT, then it must be ready to admit its own guilt – **the US runs covert operations and overt news agencies thereby interfering in the elections of sovereign nations worldwide.**

US interference in the political affairs of sovereign nations has reached such a fever pitch that both [Poland](#) and [Hungary](#) are risking sanctions by endeavoring to nationalize their own presses, purging them of foreign influence and liberal values that run contrary to their own traditional values; both Poland and Hungary are fed up with Western interference and are insisting that they have the right as sovereign nations to control their own media outlets. In response, the EU, US and UK have labeled the Polish and Hungarian governments as autocratic threats to European liberal values and therefore deserving of economic sanctions and judicial review. It seems that the liberal [Western nations demand freedom of the press and defend it to the hilt when it involves their interests, but when it works against their interests it is somehow a bad thing.](#) This is the type of hypocrisy that has inflamed Euroscepticism, the type of hypocrisy that brought Trump to power in the USA. Poland and Hungary simply want freedom over their own presses. If the US wants to operate in Poland and elsewhere under the shield: "Freedom of the Press", they are going to have to permit others to do the same and admit that Russia's freedom to operate Sputnik and RT is legal, and licit; it does *not* constitute criminal interference in American elections; **Freedom of the Press is a legal inalienable freedom available to all nations, not just some.**

If the US can employ its propaganda arm operating freely within other nations as a basic democratic right, why is it *not* a democratic freedom when Russia does the same? Why is it a crime for Russia to voice its political opinion in another country and not a violation of freedom when the United

States does so, and continues to do so even over the voice of executive and parliamentary opposition in countries such as Poland and Hungary who are being denied freedom of the press in their own countries while Germany, the US and UK operated on their soils under the shield of free press. The United States even operates its press and propaganda campaigns within Russia itself. If the US can do so, it is overt hypocrisy to deny Russia the same right? In other words, there is no case against Russia as Trump has continually stated – the intel community has come up with nothing but the Sputnik – RT accusations.

The lack of a compelling evidence to support the allegations of Russian espionage affecting the US election is so weak that President Trump has called those who advocate increased tensions and pressure on Russia as “haters” and “fools”:

When will all the haters and fools out there realize that having a good relationship with Russia is a good thing, not a bad thing. There always playing politics – bad for our country. I want to solve North Korea, Syria, Ukraine, terrorism, and Russia can greatly help!

– Donald J. Trump (@realDonaldTrump) [November 12, 2017](#)

Trump's Desire for Peace is Risky in a Political Milieu Wherein Major Players Profit by War and Propagation of a Liberal Agenda

By indicating his willingness to trust Putin and perhaps reduce sanctions against Russia, Trump risks alienating himself from his own intelligence community. He is fully aware of the risks, **but clearly trying to balance them:**

*“I believe that he (Putin) feels that he and Russia did not meddle in the election. As to whether I believe it or not, **I am with our agencies**, especially as currently constituted with the leadership... I believe that our intel agencies, our intelligence agencies, **I work with them very strongly... as currently led, by fine people, I believe very much in our intelligence agencies.**”*

Clearly, Trump recognizes the risks and is trying to play both sides of the coin. He would benefit by a cooperative intelligence community, one that promotes the interests of the American people, not one that spies on them, by a foreign policy that advances global peace rather than political and military interference in the affairs of other sovereign nations in the name of liberal democracy. He is being hindered by an ideology that produces ongoing conflict instead of long desired peace. Warhawks such as Senator McCain who serve the interests of special lobbies and an outdated global vision, a vision locked in World War II-Viet Nam nostalgia and Soviet espionage, warhawks such as these are a plague to peace initiatives. Although they continue to exercise strong influence, in the last analysis it is President Trump who is Commander in Chief; it is he who will decide when and where to commit American Troops and when to use them to back sanctions and engage in military operations. Despite stern opposition to his Russian peace initiatives, Mr. Trump has the large swathe of the American electorate behind him.

In this regard, he seems to have broad support of the **American people** who, according to a recent [Rasmussen Poll](#) (November 13-14, 2017), **agree by nearly a two-to-one margin that a friendly relationship with Russia is of greater value to the United States and the international community than the current hawkish policy that exacerbates relations with Moscow.**

The specific question asked by Rasmussen pollsters was lifted from Trump’s own statement about Russia. They asked: *“Do you*

agree or disagree with the following statement:"

"Having Russia in a friendly posture, as opposed to always fighting with them, is an asset to the world, and an asset to our country, not a liability."

The results (according to the Rasmussen) indicate that a "sharp turnaround" has occurred among the American electorate since the Cold War years during which the broad majority were against improved relations with Russia. Today however,

"Voters by a two-to-one margin agree with President Trump that it's better for the United States – and the world – to have Russia on our side."

Looking further into the issue, Rasmussen found that

"79% of conservatives agree that it's better to be friends with Russia, but just 27% of liberals share that view."

The **21% of Conservative Republicans who oppose friendly relations** are drawn from Neocon Warhawks such as Sen. McCain. The **73% of Liberal Democrats who also oppose friendly relations** with Russia are drawn primarily from those who are opposed on moral grounds: their liberal freedoms such as abortion and homosexuality are being combatted in Russia.

Although 79% of all Republicans agree with President Trump, the 21% who disagree represent POWERFUL LOBBIES in the Arms Industry and Intelligence Community supported by Neocon War Hawks in Congress who are further emboldened by a strange alliance with a broad spectrum of liberals (73%), who, like Hillary Clinton, are hawkish about American Foreign Policy as are Republican Neocons (Republican Neocon Hawks surprisingly preferred and voted for Hilary Clinton NOT Trump). The **Neocon Republicans and Liberal Democrats; are both purveyors of broadscale liberalism.** Both insist, contrary to President

Trump, that America should be the world's police force and its moral majority, the strong arm enforcer of its liberal moral policies and neoliberal economic initiatives.

The 21% Republican and 73% Democratic cohorts should *not* be considered separately; ON THE ISSUE OF FOREIGN POLICY, THEY ARE IN AGREEMENT. One desires American Foreign Policy to protect its economic hegemony and the other to advance its liberal moral agenda.

Although the president has the majority of his party with him, and a two to one majority among the American electorate (on the Russian Issue) he nonetheless is operating from a near minority. His **opponents consist of 73% Liberal Democrats and a very strong 21% of his own Party**. What this means is that the 2-1 advantage in the American electorate reported by Rasmussen is negated in reality.

Conclusion

The reason for the 2-1 result is based on the fact that, according to Rasmussen, a full **21% of the American electorate** (Republican and Democratic) **are still "undecided"** about relations with Russia. **This 21% will be pivotal in the struggle over US relations with Russia.** A small group rose to catapult Trump into the presidency, now he needs a similar small group to advance his peace initiatives. Will warhawks, neocons, and their liberal allies continue to get their way, continue to keep America in a constant posture of global policeman threatening war and economic sanctions on all nations that disagree with their neoliberal economic and moral policies, or will President Trump who is seeking a new path toward peace prevail?

Judging from the *corrected* Rasmussen numbers (corrected by the 21% undecided), the President is in a difficult position. He wants peace, which he sees is contingent in many ways upon

cooperation with Russia. He has the support of a large segment of the American population, while a lesser but very powerful group of Republicans and Democrat warhawks representing the Intelligence Community, Arms Industry, and Ideological Left are opposed to peace with Russia while another 21% of the electorate remain undecided. The President will have to assume more oversight of the intelligence community, reign in his generals, somehow deal with the greed of those men and women economically invested in expanded military operations, and, of course, deal with the liberal left who stand opposed to any *rapprochement* with a Christianizing Russia that threatens their hard won "liberal freedoms".

Although it looks daunting, Rasmussen did report a 2-1 advantage. **If a majority of the undecided 21% support Trump candidates in the upcoming (Nov. 2018) Congressional elections, the scenario becomes much more favorable for a *rapprochement* with Russia and global peace.** In the context of the Virgin Mary's promises at Fatima for an Era of Peace, New Era forecasts a victory for the US President and looks forward to cooperation between the United States and Russia, cooperation that will result in the defeat of terrorism and a real possibility for an Era of Peace..

As concluded in a [December 2016 article](#):

"The age of liberal global hegemony is coming to an end. Increasingly, the nations of the world are opting for national sovereignty and a restoration of traditional family values as the Era of Peace promised at Fatima continues to dawn upon the nations."

If the US continues down its overworn, liberal, neocon path, a path heavily trodden by both Democrats and Republicans, by both Presidents Bush and Obama, if it continues down this path, the US will continue to suffer one foreign policy

embarrassment after another – it is opposing the Queen of Heaven who has promised an Era of Peace.

Pope Francis – Confusing Traditionalists – Homosexuals-Homosexuality & God’s Mercy

[New Era World News and Global Intelligence:](#)

EXACTLY ONE YEAR HAS PASSED since Cardinal Burke and three other “Red Hats” issued their well known clerical “dubia”, which might be interpreted as a public prosecutorial attempt to “cross-examine” the Vicar of Christ ([Amoris Laetitia](#)) whose pastoral approach to divorce and remarriage is not quite to their liking and apparently beyond their comprehension. Although two of the original dubia architects have gone to their death during this one-year period and although the former [Prefect for the Congregation of the Faith \(CDF\)](#) clearly [indicated that there was nothing in the pope’s exhortation on divorce and remarriage that contradicted the Church’s perennial teachings about marital union](#), despite these things, the remaining two cardinals have *not* relented, have *not* relinquished their demand to publicly cross examine the Vicar of Christ as if somehow they, they and not the Successor of Peter, are the guarantors of the Supreme Magisterium.

Rather than continue to deflect the assault on the papacy regarding the issue of *Amoris Laetitia*, [as we have done elsewhere](#), it is hoped that there is didactic value in demonstrating the ludicrous and base assertions contained in

three related attacks on the reigning pontiff (homosexuality, the death penalty, and marriage) thereby lending credence to the supposition that it is *not* the Vicar of Christ but the prelates who are causing the confusion. The fact that the pope's rudimentary remarks on these three topics, in the context of mercy, *supposedly* caused confusion among ranking churchmen raises various questions: Are their aging minds becoming too feeble to remember basic catechesis or to dull to make moral distinctions necessary for pastoral theology or are they so rooted in negativity that they are unable to see the good being proposed by the pope ([Luke 6: 40-42](#))? Since these men are towering "Princes of the Holy Roman Catholic Church", questions about their intellectual ability should be readily dismissed; it is safer to presume that they are endowed with the requisite intellectual virtues. It is *not* they but their readers and facilitators who are either easily confused or willing purveyors of their confusing confusion, purveyors who should be clarifying the confusion rather than enhancing it.

If questions regarding intellectual ability are dismissed, as it seems they should be, other more *dubious* questions arise pertaining to motive, intriguing questions, which require investigation beyond the scope of this article. **The purpose of this article** (and two companion articles) **is to explore the absurdity of what now seems to be daily base assertions**, assertions that are so clearly fallacious that they tend to force the inquiring mind to pray for rational insight that explains their ongoing dogged persistence, a persistence that has the net effect of defaming this pope. When these three issues are examined (homosexuality, the death penalty, and marriage), when it is demonstrated that any person trained in rudimentary catechesis should be able to grasp what the pope is saying, it should be clear, or at least plausible, that it is *not* Pope Francis who is causing confusion; rather, the confusion is being engendered by a set of dubious detractors.

HOMOSEXUALITY

Several adherents of the extreme “Religious Right” stepped up their attacks against Pope Francis following his July 29, 2013 statement in response to a question posed by journalist Ilze Scamparini during a press conference granted to journalists on a flight back from Rio de Janeiro following World Youth Day. A veritable fire storm broke out over the pope’s response:

“If a person is gay and seeks the Lord and has good will, who am I to judge that person?”

Ilze Scamparini

Scamparini’s specific question was:

“I would like permission to ask a delicate question: another image that has been going around the world is that of Monsignor Ricca and the news about his private life. I would like to know, Your Holiness, what you intend to do about this? How are you confronting this issue and how does Your Holiness intend to confront the whole question of the gay lobby?”

Scamparini’s inquiry consists of two parts; to the first question Pope Francis replied:

*“I did what canon law calls for, that is a preliminary investigation. And from this investigation, there was nothing of what had been alleged. We did not find anything of that. **This is the response.** But I wish to add something else:…If a person, whether it be a lay person, a priest or a religious sister, commits a sin and then converts, the Lord forgives, and when the Lord forgives, the Lord forgets and this is very important for our lives. When we confess our sins and we truly say, “I have sinned in this”, the Lord forgets, and so we have no right not to forget, because otherwise we would*

*run the risk of the Lord not forgetting our sins. That is a danger. This is important: a theology of sin. Many times I think of Saint Peter. He committed one of the worst sins, that is he denied Christ, and even with this sin they made him Pope. We have to think a great deal about that. But, returning to your question more concretely. **In this case, I conducted the preliminary investigation and we didn't find anything.**"*

This first query involving interim Vatican Banker, Msgr. Ricca is *not* relevant here; we are (as is Pope Francis) interested in the second query, dealing with homosexual "tendencies" and a purported "gay lobby" (or any perverse lobby) operating at the Vatican. Before proceeding to the second part, the part dealing with the "gay lobby" and homosexual tendencies, it is important to note that **the pope's remark, "who am I to judge" was NOT made in reference to the first question**, although his detractors like to make it appear as if it did.

As [John Thavis astutely noted](#):

*"Amid the media attention that inevitably followed, it's important to note that although the pope was responding to a question about an alleged "gay lobby" in the Vatican, **his comment was not specifically about gay priests.**"*

"Some media have portrayed the pope as saying he would not judge priests for their sexual orientation, which would seem to call into question the Vatican's 2005 document that ruled out ordination for men with "deep-seated homosexual tendencies." Based on the pope's actual words, I think that's a stretch."

In fact, Pope Francis did make a judgement to conduct an investigation, as he should of. **The words "who am I to judge**

were made in reference to the second question pertaining to a gay lobby which takes precedence over the question about gay priests. Francis shifted emphasis from gay priests, such as Ricca, to focus on the question pertaining to a gay lobby, but he never separated the gay lobby from his response about penitent gays, which he expands in response to the second question. This is clear because at the end of his first answer, following the words " I conducted the *preliminary investigation* and we didn't find anything", he stated

"This is the first question. Then, you spoke about the gay lobby."

In answer to this latter question, Francis responded:

*"So much is written about the gay lobby. I still haven't found anyone with an identity card in the Vatican with "gay" on it. They say there are some there. I believe that when you are dealing with such a person, you must **distinguish between the fact of a person being gay and the fact of someone forming a lobby**, because not all lobbies are good. **This one is not good** (a gay lobby). **If** (on the other hand) **someone is gay and is searching for the Lord and has good will, then who am I to judge him?**"*

*"The Catechism of the Catholic Church explains this in a beautiful way, saying: **"no one should marginalize these people for this, they must be integrated into society"**. **The problem is not having this tendency**, no, we must be brothers and sisters to one another, and there is this one and there is that one. **The problem is in making a lobby of this tendency**: a lobby of misers, a lobby of politicians, a lobby of masons, so many lobbies. For me, this is the greater problem."*

On Return Flight from World Youth Day in Rio de Janeiro Pope Francis asked: 'If a person is gay... who am I to judge?'

The problem is not the tendency but making a lobby of the tendency. In other words, being penitent and remaining "in the closet", that is keeping one's homosexuality tendency to one's self **while working on it** is *not* a problem that deters the pope or the Church from conducting its works. **What is a problem**, a BIG problem, however is *not* being penitent, but rather **being defiant, publicly defiant and forming a militant yet mondaine lobby of dilettante rebellious sophisticates to challenge the Church from the inside**. The pope clearly says that **this is a problem**. This problem is obviously on his mind!

Before continuing, Francis states clearly that such a gay lobby is **"NOT GOOD"**. He then states, that in contradistinction to a "bad", defiant, publicly vocal, and rebellious gay lobby of homosexual sophisticates, a single person who is penitent and fighting homosexual urges while keeping peace in the community is *not* a problem, *certainly not*, especially when compared to the former, which he hints might exist at the Vatican:

*"I still haven't found anyone with an identity card in the Vatican with "gay" on it. (Nonetheless) **They say there are some there.**"*

Msgr Ricca, however is not one of them, presumably he falls into the second grouping to which the pope addressed his now famous words:

*"**If someone is gay and is searching for the Lord and has good will, then who am I to judge him?**"*

The pope reiterates this point by quoting the Catechism

followed by some more personal remarks that drive his point home :

*“No one should marginalize these people for this, they must be integrated into society”. The problem is not having this tendency, no, we must be brothers and sisters to one another, and there is this one and there is that one. **The problem is in making a lobby of this tendency: a lobby of misers, a lobby of politicians, a lobby of masons, so many lobbies. For me, this is the greater problem.**”*

This problem has grown so acute that it has apparently penetrated the hallowed ramparts of Malta leading [Pope Francis to order a purge of Freemasons from the Knights of Malta](#).

For a long time, many on the right have been pleading for the popes to clean house; now that the cleaning has commenced many of the supplicants ravenous for a papal crackdown, are finding themselves on the bristles tips.

In the Holy Father's own words:

“[There are also cases of malicious resistance](#), which spring up in misguided minds and come to the fore when the devil inspires ill intentions (often cloaked in sheep's clothing).”

*“This last kind of resistance **hides behind words of self-justification and often accusation**,” he said. “It takes refuge in **traditions, appearances, formalities**, in the familiar, or else in a desire to make everything personal, failing to distinguish between (among) the **ACT**, the **ACTOR** and the **ACTION**” (please remember that Francis said this).*

By using words such as *traditions, appearances and formalities*, it is quite clear whom the pope is referring to. [His words are similar to those](#)

[of Cardinal Ratzinger](#) when he headed the Sacred Congregation for the Doctrine of Faith (CDF):

“It is necessary to be strong in faith and to resist error even when it masquerades as piety.”

The culprit is then brought into stark relief when the sacred scriptures point their light on the theme or error, piety, tradition etc:

*“And what I do I will continue to do, **in order to end this pretext** of those who seek a pretext for being regarded as we are in the mission of which they boast. For **such people are false apostles, deceitful workers, who masquerade as apostles of Christ**. And no wonder, for even Satan masquerades as an angel of light. So it is not strange that his **ministers** also masquerade as ministers of righteousness” ([2 Corinthians 11: 12-15](#)).*

The Issue is Clear enough for a School Boy, Why are the Dubia Cardinals Confused?

Clearly, Pope Francis was speaking about penitent homosexuals who in humility keep their sins to themselves rather than forming lobbies of defiant and rebellious epicurean gourmands working to undermine the Church. Moreover, the distinction that he made by the words “Who am I to judge” is so basic a mere school boy possessing elementary catechesis could make the distinction necessary to understand what the pope was saying in this *supposedly* confusing case.

The folks as Novus Ordo Watch ([NOW](#)) are apparently as confused as the dubia cardinals and other purveyors of dubious papal ideas. According to them (NOW):

“For a supposed Vicar of Jesus Christ to make such a comment

*is beyond irresponsible and foolish, not to mention harmful and scandalous. Francis plays right into the wrong-headed but widespread idea that some people are homosexual in their identity, **in their nature**, as part of “who they are”. This is exactly what modern-day liberals want you to believe, that just as people are biologically either male or female, so they are also biologically either heterosexual or homosexual.”*

The pope *never* made any mention of biological determinism. He merely said, “The problem is *not* having this tendency” (or, the problem is *not* this tendency). To say that he meant a biologically determined tendency is to put words into his mouth, corrupt words that vitiate his meaning. More positively, Francis’ words can be taken to mean concupiscence, urge, temptation etc. which when acted upon habitually orient a person towards sin. This is the “tendency” he is talking about. **The problem is not concupiscence, but acting on it.** A worse problem, the one pointed out by Francis, is not only acting on the tendency but also flaunting it, defending it and militantly fighting for it by forming an advocacy group such as a lobby of churchmen; this he refers to as “bad”, very bad indeed. Is anyone with a sane mind going to disagree with his analysis thus far? What is worse (1) having a temptation to sin and fighting it, (2) having a temptation and acting on it but afterward expressing penitence and remorse as well as a resolve to fight it and keep it private while admitting error or (3) arguing that homosexuality is not morally illicit, but a natural expression to be lauded and publicly supported by high ranking churchmen? Now, honestly, which is worse, if you said (3) then you agree with the pope. Why is this confusing?

An even more basic distinction is the one between **judging actions** and **judging intentions** (actor) having to do with eternal salvation. Clearly such distinctions must be made, as Francis indicates, among Act, Actor and Action. Almost every

lay person is familiar with the famous dictum to “hate the sin (act) but not the sinner’ (actor) or to “judge the sin but not the sinner”. This distinction is so basic, how can any honest person miss it. Are we to presume that the self proclaimed brilliant theologians at *Novus Ordo et al*, those brilliant enough to call the pope a heretic and schismatic, are we to suppose that such brilliant people are bereft of elementary school knowledge as to be unable to make such a rudimentary distinction? What in Heaven’s name is going on here?

To quote scriptures, as they do, about the necessity of judging all things does nothing to counter the pope’s remarks. He is well aware of the distinction. Every schoolboy knows it is licit to judge acts but impossible to make judgements about eternal salvation, which belongs to God alone ([Revelation 20:11-14](#)). Thus, when scripture says to judge all things, it is referring to acts.

“But the spiritual man judgeth all things; and he himself is judged of no man” ([1 Corinthians 2:15](#)).

Because they fail to distinguish among act, actor and action, they also fail at understanding the pope’s meaning. When Francis asks “who am I to judge”, he is referring to eternal damnation or intentions in the soul (the actor-not the act) which only God knows. Because radical sedevacantists and many less radical traditionalists fail to give the pope this much, this much that even a Catholic school boy can be presumed to know it, they not only [get it all wrong](#), they cause scandal and disseminate confusion as do the folks at [NOW](#):

“So, Francis asks rhetorically, “Who am I to judge?” Holy Scripture may help in answering this question: “But the spiritual man judgeth all things; and he himself is judged of no man” (1 Cor 2:15). So, who is Francis to judge? Well... obviously not the spiritual man! Thanks for making it clear, Mr. Bergoglio.”

Not so quick boys, Francis is the pope; he is not your straw man. Clearly he is referring to subjective intentions and eternity not *about* objective acts. HE IS TALKING ABOUT AN INABILITY TO JUDGE SUBJECTIVE CULPABILITY (the actor) especially the moral or theological culpability of a person who manifests "good will" and "who seeks God". Francis is *not* referring to those so steeped in sin that they make a lobby out of it; these he has no problem judging; clearly their acts are, as he says, "bad". By referring to such perverse lobbies as "bad" Pope Francis has made a judgement in accord with ([Jude 1:22](#)):

"And some indeed reprove, being judged: But others save, pulling them out of the fire. And on others have mercy, in fear, hating also the spotted garment which is carnal."

Clearly, the pope has no problem judging manifest corrupt actions. But he carefully and correctly refrains from judging the eternal destiny of any man, his subjective culpability before the Throne of God. Those who need reproof, those whom he does judge as "bad" are the scandalous non-penitents. So to argue that the pope refrains from judging and somehow approves of sin or somehow supports it, is not only puerile it is basically ridiculous, perhaps intended for the ignorant and easily persuaded or for the naysayers looking for anything to defame another, *esp* another whom they dislike, such as the pope who as the Vicar of Christ has many enemies. Are you going to be dissuaded by this childish cabal meant only to confuse?

More recently ([Nov 30, 2015](#)), the pope reiterated and clarified his thoughts on this issue:

*"I will repeat what I said on my first trip. I repeat what the Catechism of the Catholic Church says: that they must not be discriminated against, that they must be respected and accompanied pastorally. **One can condemn, but not for***

theological reasons, but for reasons of political behavior (that is for crimes) ... But these are things that have nothing to do with the problem. The problem is a person that has a condition, that has good will and who seeks God, who are we to judge? And we must accompany them well...this is what the catechism says, a clear catechism."

Ultra Right Sedevacantists have twisted the hell out of this by failing to distinguish between penitent and manifest non-penitent sinners as Pope Francis does and by failing to make a proper distinction between condemnation of acts as crimes and condemnation of persons to hell, and also failing to make clear the fact that judgement MUST PRECEDE condemnation. One cannot condemn a person until one has judged that person. Clearly, a "political judgment" (a licit condemnation) for a violation of a moral precept resulting in temporal punishment for a "crime" can be made as Francis clearly states, but not a theological judgement leading to condemnation of a person for eternity, which only God can make. Why is this so hard?

The pope clearly states that evil acts or "behaviors" can be judged as bad (he even referred to the homosexual lobby as bad). However, when he speaks about an inability to judge, he is NOT speaking about **Time but Eternity**, not speaking of judging a person's objective acts but the subjective guilt or innocence of a person's soul. The sedevacantists at [One Peter Five](#) not only miss this basic distinction; they misuse the words judge and condemn:

"Amidst that super-sized word salad are some key points...and a reinforcement (rather than a corrective clarification) of Francis' own controversial stance on this issue. Francis asserts that "One can condemn, homosexual people/behaviors but not for theological reasons...(so far ok).

But then they assert:

*"Of course, this is absolutely false. **Not only can we condemn sodomy, we must if we wish to exercise an authentic pastoral care and concern for souls.**"*

Sorry, but NO we cannot "condemn sodomy" (unless it is a crime – did they miss this?). **God does not condemn sodomy; He proscribes sodomy** (act) as a moral evil **and condemns sodomites** (actors or persons). A human judge however, can both judge sodomy to be wrong and condemn a sodomite to prison (if such a law exists-Francis refers to this as a "political" condemnation – not a theological condemnation, which is not possible). When it comes to the pope's statement about not being able to make a judgement, he is referring to making a judgement about a person's intentions and eternal destiny. **He is aware, as is any school boy, that acts can be judged, but persons cannot be condemned "theologically"**. Francis judges homosexuality (action) to be objectively bad, but he is unable to either condemn the homosexual (actor) "*theologically*" or to make a judgement about a homosexual's hidden intentions or the eternal destiny of their souls. No one can condemn another (to hell), only God can do this. **Thus, the pope is correct, there is NO THEOLOGICAL REASON for condemning a soul.** Rather, it is the correct attitude, an attitude of love and mercy, to accompany a sincere soul seeking God on the road to perfection, a road on which they will conquer their sins and wrongful inclinations. Now who is confused, the pope or the traditionalists at One Peter Five?

In saying "Who am I to judge", the pope is clearly referring to a person who is penitent and seeking God (see video 1:00). Why is this hard to understand?

Francis was clearly making a distinction between judging acts and judging person's intentions. Moreover, he was making a distinction between penitent and non-penitent sinners. To

drive the point home, consider the following:

In the wake of the “Who am I to judge” affair, Monsignor Krzysztof Charamsa, a Polish priest who worked for the CDF, **publicly announced** that he was in a gay relationship. Following the spin given by the pope’s enemies and detractors, would you be surprised to learn that [Msgr. Charamsa was relieved of his duties at the Vatican](#) as well as his teaching posts at two of Rome’s Pontifical universities? He was relieved of his duties because he intended to remain in a sinful relationship.

In fact Msgr Charamsa wrongfully [insisted that Pope Francis “revise Catholic doctrine on homosexuality, which considers same-sex relationships sinful.”](#)

The pope had no problem judging the monsignor’s acts as wrong – they were obvious, he persisted in, boasted about, and sought to justify his sin thereby hurting himself and causing scandal; nonetheless, **Francis did not and could not ‘condemn’ the churchman** (that is for eternity), but he did judge his blatant actions. As far as his intentions, the msgr. made them known to all by persisting in sin and seeking to justify it, thereby making it easy to judge his ill intentions – a person who sins and repents and acts well does not provide any evidence by which to judge his intentions. The non-penitent, who claims he has a right to sin, who forms a bold lobby thereby loudly proclaiming his intentions can be judged (but not condemned **unless his corresponding acts are also crimes**), in such a case, he can be politically or temporally condemned. The forgiven penitent who seeks to serve God can be both judged and condemned politically, his acts can also be judged theologically (acts of which a sincere penitent presumably has few if any, in fact, there might not be any remaining acts to judge), but he *cannot* be condemned theologically – this is Francis point!

Clearly, the pope’s “Who am I to judge” remarks have been

twisted, perverted and misrepresented. **It is not the pope who is causing confusion, but his detractors.**

If this is not enough, the pope chose to answer his detractors in his recently released book ["The Name of God is Mercy "](#) in which he states:

"On that occasion I said this: If a person is gay and seeks out the Lord and is willing, who am I to judge that person?" the pope says. "I was paraphrasing by heart the Catechism of the Catholic Church where it says that these people should be treated with delicacy and not be marginalized."

"I am glad that we are talking about 'homosexual people' because before all else comes the individual person, in his wholeness and dignity," he continues. "And people should not be defined only by their sexual tendencies: let us not forget that God loves all his creatures and we are destined to receive his infinite love."

"I prefer that homosexuals come to confession, that they stay close to the Lord, and that we pray all together,"** says Francis. "You can advise them to pray, **show goodwill, show them the way, and accompany them along it."

The pope clearly has no problem clarifying his statements, apparently to good-willed people not intent on perverting them. Even a schoolboy can follow the pope's elementary thinking. How often did Jesus reuse to answer his detractors?


Please ask yourself: Am I confused because I actually read what the pope said (if so please re-read with these notes in mind). Or am I confused because someone else told me about what the pope wrote? If so please ignore that person and find out for yourself.

Part II to Follow

Medjugorje Spiritual Guides, New Age Spiritism and Global Liberalism

[\(New Era World News\)](#)

THE PRIESTS WHO ACTED AS ADVISORS and spiritual guides of the Medjugorje seers present a host of problems for the authenticity of supernatural events that reportedly happened and continue to happen there. As pointed out in [Article Five](#), their disobedience and sexual activity do *not* bode well for the authenticity of supernatural claims made by the “seers”. The themes of *disobedience*, *sexual aberrance*, and a new wrinkle – cultic *New Age Spirituality* – will be examined in the current article wherein another Franciscan Friar, Spiritual Director, and Confidant of the “seers”, Father Tomislav Vlastic, is examined for all three of these transgressions.



Father Tomislav Vlastic

Tomislav Vlasic (born 1942), is a laicized Catholic priest who was formerly a member of the Franciscan Order, from Bosnia-Herzegovina and spiritual director of the seers of Medjugorje. Although ordained in 1969, by 1976, while still a priest, Vlasic became sexually involved with a Roman Catholic nun named Sister Rufina whom he impregnated and then sent away to Germany with the ardent request to keep their pregnancy secret. The child Toni was born in Germany on January 25, 1977. **Sister Rufina** kept their secret but nonetheless, in a series of intercepted letters to her lover, she could not restrain herself. Unfortunately for Vlasic, the letters found their way to the *Congregation for the Doctrine of Faith* headed by Cardinal Joseph Ratzinger who kept them concealed until 1984.

Meanwhile, in 1981 Father Vlasic attended an International Charismatic Meeting in Rome during which it was prophesied that, with the help of the Virgin Mary, he would lead a "multitude of people" from a place from which came forth "rivers of water."

Following this charismatic jolt, within two months after the apparitions began at Medjugorje (July, 1981), Vlasic without permission from his Ordinary, abandoned his formal assignment in Capljina and headed for Medjugorje where he quickly became the "Spiritual Director" of the alleged visionaries, [a fact that Vlasic boasted of in a letter to Pope John Paul II](#). Thus, according to the Chancellor of the Diocese of Mostar:

"In a letter dated 13 April 1984. Vlasic represented (himself to) the Pope as the one "who through divine providence guides the seers of Medjugorje".

Congruent with this new spiritual responsibility, Vlasic quickly went to work compiling the "Parish Chronicle" detailing the apparitions and appended messages from Our Lady. Although he did not begin the Chronicles until October, he back-dated them to August 11, 1981.

Then, in July of 1982, the Franciscan Provincial recommended that Fr. Vlašić be *formally assigned* as the "spiritual assistant in Medjugorje". Bishop Žanić, ignorant of Fr. Vlašić's sexual

aberrations, accepted the request on July 27, 1982, and officially installed him as a priest in his diocese assigned as Associate Pastor in Medjugorje.

It was not long until it became apparent to Bishop Žanić that Father Vlastic posed a unique challenge. In 1984, under pressure from the same bishop, a bishop who referred to him as a [“mystifier and charismatic magician”](#), Vlašić was transferred to Vitina. From here, Father Vlastic [composed a strange letter to a friend at the Vatican](#) (perhaps to an equally strange cleric named Bishop Hnilica-discussed elsewhere) in which he complained about Bishop Zanic and called for a concerted effort against him:

“It would be necessary to get all the others involved (intellectuals, theologians, bishops, cardinals...). We have to admit that Satan can also work through the structures of the Church.”

It is unclear if Fr. Vlastic, whom the bishop had called a “magus”, was referring to “*all the others*” as a conjured cabal of “intellectuals, theologians, bishops, cardinals” who had perhaps penetrated the Vatican (as commonly reported), it is unclear if he was referring to them as “Satan” or if he was referring to the regular members of the Vatican bureaucracy as Satan- typical double speak, which betrays the command given by Jesus Christ to speak plainly warning that anything else is from the devil:

“Let your ‘Yes’ mean ‘Yes,’ and your ‘No’ mean ‘No.’ Anything more is from the evil one” ([Matt 5:37](#)).

If Vlastic is employing “double speak”, given what is known of him discussed below, it can be surmised what side of the equation he is on and to whom he is referring by the clause, “*all the others*”, which also makes it clear how “Satan” can “work through the structures of the Church.” Nonetheless, after several years in Vitina, Vlastic departed for Parma, Northern Italy (1987), with **another woman who is also a supposed “seer”**, by the name of **Agnes Heupel** (Sister Rufina is raising their child without a father and Fra Vlastic is with

another woman) who was to become **Co-Founder of a gender-mixed religious community, which the two named *Kraljice mira, potpuno smo tvoji. Po Mariji k Isusu*** (“Queen of Peace, we are all yours: to Jesus through Mary”). This community received a boon when one of the Medjugorje seers, Marija Pavlovic, came to live with them in community and to experience her daily apparitions there. Eventually, [Marija even endorsed their endeavor with a statement composed on March 8, 1987](#) in which she stated:

*‘This is God’s plan... As you can see, **the Madonna has given the community its programme: ‘Kraljice mira, potpuno smo tvoji. Po Mariji k Isusu’ and is guiding this community through Fr. Tomislav and Agnes,** while sending messages through her to the community” (Agnes is a medium).*

However, on July 11, 1988, after the local bishop of Parma (who considered cohabitation between men and women as, “*totally unrelated to any form of religious community accepted by the Church*”) ordered the gender-mixed community closed, [Marija quickly retracted her statement with another](#) in which she admits to lying while simultaneously hinting at coercion ([full statement](#)).

*“From the text and testimonies which [bear my signature](#) it follows that the Madonna communicated to me that the community and the program of Father Tomislav V. and Agnes Heupel are the way God intended for me and the rest of us. **Now I repeat that I have never received from the Madonna, nor have I given to Father Tomislav V., not to any other individual, any such approval or instructions from the Madonna.***

*“My first declaration, as published in Croatian and Italian, does not correspond to the truth. I personally had no desire to give any sort of written declaration. **Father Tomislav V. kept suggesting to me, stressing over and over again, that I as a seer should write the declaration** which the world was waiting for.*

[“Before God, before the Madonna and the Church of Jesus Christ.](#)
Everything that can be understood as a confirmation or approval of this Work of Fr. Tomislav and Agnes Heupel, on the part of the Madonna through me, absolutely does not correspond to the truth and furthermore the idea that I had a spontaneous desire to write down this testimony is also not true.”

By the time the bishop of Parma ordered the community closed, Vlašić had already founded houses in four other dioceses, including one at Medjugorje, which was built in 1995 without permission or recognition by the local bishop. Fra Vlastic pulled this off with the help of yet **another laywoman and supposed “seer”, Stefania Caterina**, who in **2002** became the Vice-President of “Queen of Peace”, a growing New Age Confederation (as detailed below).

Characterized by suspicious relationships, marred by New Age mysticism, seers, and sexual aberrations, it is not surprising that in **2008** the [Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith](#) informed Fr. Vlašić that he was now the subject of investigation

*“...for the diffusion of **dubious doctrine, manipulation of consciences, suspected mysticism, disobedience** towards legitimately issued orders” and charges of **sexual misconduct** (“contra sextum”).*

On August 31 of the same year, the [CDF operating through the Bishop of Mostar](#) informed Vlastic that he had incurred the “censure of interdict *latae sententiae*”. Consequently, the CDF imposed the following sanctions: Fr Vlastic was

- (1) To be confined to the Franciscan monastery in Lombardy
- (2) To take a course in spiritual formation
- (3) To cease associating with the Queen of Peace confederation,
- (4) To refrain from juridical contracts or acts of administration, and
- (5) To cease from preaching, spiritual direction, making public statements, and practicing the sacrament of confession, under pain of

incurring the penalty of automatic [interdict](#) barring him from performing any of the sacraments.

Some Medjugorje devotees have endeavored to distance F. Vlastic's errance from Medjugorje by stressing that these penalties were incurred *after* he left Medjugorje (and therefore have nothing to do with Medjugorje). It is important to note that this argument is specious due to the fact that the CDF clearly specified that these charges and penalties were imposed:

["...within the context of the phenomenon of Medjugorje"](#)

Moreover, in the sentence just prior to the adumbration of the foregoing penalties, the CDF stated Fr. Vlastic "**is**", not "**was**" involved with Medjugorje –

*"The Decree of the Congregation mentions that Rev. Fr. Tomislav Vlašić, a cleric of the Franciscan Minor Order – the founder of the association 'Kraljice mira potpuno Tvoji – po Mariji k Isusu' and **who is** (not was) **involved in the "phenomenon Medjugorje"** – has been reported to the Congregation."*

That was Aug. 31, 2008; eleven months later, July 31, 2009, [The General Minister of the Franciscan Order](#) issued further penalties, which were imposed,

*"As a salutary penal precept – **under the pain of excommunication** which the Holy See would declare, and if necessary, without prior canonical warning – the following precepts are imposed on Mr. Tomislav Vlastic:*

a) Absolute prohibition from exercising any form of apostolate (for example, promoting public or private devotion, teaching Christian doctrine, spiritual direction, participation in lay associations, etc.) as well as of acquiring and administering goods intended for pious purposes;

b) Absolute prohibition from releasing declarations on religious matters, especially regarding the “phenomenon of Medjugorje”;

c) Absolute prohibition from residing in houses of the Order of Friars Minor.

Pope Benedict XVI laicised Father Tomislav in 2009. **He was also placed under the pain of *ex-communication***, if he should violate any of [the following stipulations](#):

“Absolute prohibition from exercising any form of apostolate (for example, promoting public or private devotion, teaching Christian doctrine, spiritual direction, participation in lay associations, etc.)” and “Absolute prohibition from releasing declarations on religious matters, especially regarding the “phenomenon of Medjugorje” .

Habitually accustomed to disobedience, it is not surprising that Vlastic, now a layman, has chosen to ignore and disobey even these severe prohibitions. Along with Ms. Stefania Caterina, he continues to give spiritual direction, to publicly preach, to teach about Medjugorje (he built a Queen of Peace House there in 1985), to participate in lay associations and to promote private devotions as contained in at least 30 of their video products available in several languages on their [video channel](#) and contained in almost every [article available on their website](#). Especially egregious and heretical is their promotion of alien beings and an advanced group of avatars known as the “*Central Nucleus*” which is a code name for the New Age realm of *Shamballah*:

Stefania Caterina and Tomislav Vlastic members of “Central Nucleus” with Statue of Lady of Medjugorje (Queen of Peace) in background.

From the Video:

Caterina [08:11]: “We want to tell you clearly that **both Tomislav Vlašić and I belong to the Central Nucleus**. We have been called to this task more than ten years ago. Of course we could not reveal it because then the Lord had to fix so many pieces in a very large mosaic, concerning not only Earth but the entire universe.”

*“Jesus said clearly that it is a small number of people. We do not go over 50 in number. Indeed, **we are 49 to be exact**. And why? **Because the Central Nucleus is divided into seven nuclei**. Seven nuclei, at the head of which is one of the seven great archangels. [...] [17:24] People who are part of it come from different mankinds, not only from Earth (that is, they come from other planets). Moreover, those of us who come from Earth are very few [she smiles-that makes she and Vlasic very special entities]. And they come from other mankinds of the universe. Some of them are dead.”*

***Vlasic** [21:33]: “We can talk about some mankinds in the universe, who have remained faithful to God: they form a nucleus, all the people are a nucleus. But in this large nucleus there are many small nuclei, which move similarly to the Central Nucleus. They move, and at the same time the people provide the best nuclei for the **mission in the whole universe**, and these hook to the Central Nucleus. Thus, since early this year, these three instruments are working: the **pure spirits**, the **Central Nucleus**, and **brothers and sisters faithful to God**, who have been faithful to God from the beginning of creation.”*

This is basically the esoteric [Thesophy of Alice Bailey](#) in the vernacular. Bailey devoted her life to preparing disciples to work with “ascended masters” for the good of humanity:

*“The Plan for humanity requires the cooperation and service of trained and dedicated human beings intelligently informed about world affairs, in collaboration with those who form the **spiritual Hierarchy**, the inner government of the planet (who work with more advanced beings who govern the solar system and galaxy.*

Caterina wrote about her experiences and messages she received from extra-terrestrial beings in her book [“Beyond the Great Barrier”](#) (2008). Her experiences began in 1984, with a being named [“Ashtar Sheran commander of interplanetary fleet from the planet Alpha Centauri”](#); she also introduces her readers to Sheran’s wife, Kalna, to the priest-king Aris and others from Alpha Centauri. Odd as this might seem, [Caterina boldly asserts her Catholic and Marian identity:](#)

*“I believe in God and I offer Him my life, through the **Immaculate Heart of Mary**. I am Italian and a **practising Catholic**. Extraordinary experiences have always been part of my life. Since childhood, God has granted me the gift of being able to communicate with Him in a special manner, by means of visions and interior locutions.”*

“I believe it is my duty to obey Jesus’ wishes, bearing witness to what I was able to see and listen to. If I failed to do this, living in fear of human judgement, I would be denying the Lord and His life within me.”

These experiences have come about through interior locutions and visions, during which explanations were given to me by the Lord himself or by His instruments, first among which, Saint Raphael archangel. I received many explanations from the souls of Purgatory regarding their state, and from men of other planets regarding the universe and the life that is present within it.”

“I did not learn these things from anyone. I did not use methods, nor did I consult any books. I never contacted mediums. For me there is only one Mediator, Jesus Christ.”

Immaculate Heart of Mary, practicing Catholic, Jesus Christ, sound good, but who is this Jesus she refers to?

According to New Age theosophy, there are Seven Kohans who rule the solar system underneath a New Age Trinity which is the universal manifestation of the eternal God. These seven Kohans are known by various other names, such as: ‘the seven Spirits before the throne’, ‘the seven solar Deities’, ‘the primordial Seven’, ‘the seven Builders’, ‘the seven Manus’, ‘Flames’ or ‘Ray Lords’. It is their responsibility to **direct the solar evolution of consciousness** by use of the seven rays that emanate from the Trinity. Each of the seven major planets receives one of the seven rays and directs their divine influence throughout the solar system. Each of the seven rays are overseen by the seven ‘Ray Lords’ who teach disciples to walk along the Seven Paths to God.

The earth is considered a minor planet; it is ruled by a being known as ‘[Sanat Kumara](#)’ or the ‘[Ancient of Days](#)’, ‘the One in Whom we move and live and have our being’, ‘the Light of the World’, ‘the Eternal Youth’ and ‘the God of Love’. He is the “Ancient of Days” of Judaism and Christianity, Skanda/Kartikkeya in Hinduism, Brahma-**Sanam Kumar** in Buddhism, the Ahura Mazda in Zoroastrianism etc. Sanat is considered to be the saviour of mankind and the light of the world.

Although Hinduism, Judaism *et al* and New Age Theosophists, like Madame Blavatsky, Alice Bailey, C.W. Leadbeater and Elizabeth Clare Prophet all have different versions of New Age [cosmology](#) (structure and development of the universe) and [cosmogony](#) (origin of the universe), New Age thinkers share a basic schema – the schema for planet earth looks something like this:

The ruler of this planet is Sanat Kumara, beneath him are a trinity of highly evolved but lesser beings, analogues to the higher solar trinity (of a higher god, the “solar logos whose body is that of the

entire solar system), known as the “Buddhas of Activity” or Pratyeka Buddha’s. Along with Sanat, **they receive the seven divine energies and distribute them throughout the earth to stimulate the evolution of human consciousness.**

According to [Alice A. Bailey](#), along with Sanat Kumara, they form a governing council that conducts business in a palatial room known as ‘*The Council Chamber of the Lord of the World*’. Here Sanat meets with Maitreya, the Ascended Masters of Ancient Wisdom such as Maha Chohan and the **Master Jesus et al** to assess their efforts at mind control through use the seven energy rays that pass through the air waves, what they refer to as assisting humanity to achieve higher levels of consciousness. The **Great Council** is also known as ‘**Shamballa**’ or the “Heaven of Earth” (*The New Age Dictionary*, p. 172).

Shamballa, constructed by Sanat Kumara, is thought to reside on the “fourth etheric plane” of the planet earth floating above the Gobi Desert. Each planet has seven planes of existence within a spectrum that extends from pure spirit to densest matter. The etheric plane is more ethereal than the lower planes of raw matter, liquid and gas. The beings that reside on the etheric plane are highly evolved human beings who have shed their physical bodies. Together with Sanat Kumara and the Buddha’s of activity, they form a governing council that resides on Shamballa.

The Council consists of “Department Heads” who oversee three diverse yet integral departments:

First Department-Department of the Will: Overseen by a being named ‘**Manu**’ who works out the will and purpose of Sanat Kumara by directing the energies that effect the human will concerned with planetary government and politics

Second Department-Love and Wisdom: Overseen by the ‘**Bodhisattva**’ also known as the ‘*Christ*’, the ‘World Teacher’ or the ‘*Lord Maitreya*’, the Teacher of mankind and of angels as well. He is the expression of love whose mission it is to develop consciousness by directing the energies that effect the religions of the world.

Third Department – Intelligence: Overseen by the ‘Mahachohan’ or *Lord of Civilization* who is responsible to direct the energies affecting the social and financial centers of the world

Below these three departments are **seven major esoteric schools or ‘ashrams’**, (the seven spoken of by Vlasic and Caterina) each led by a planetary Chohan. Under these seven *major ashrams* are forty-nine *minor ashrams*, led by [Ascended Masters](#) (the number given above by Caterina) who are working through select disciples known as ‘Masters of Wisdom’ to teach and form high ranking adepts (Vlasic and Caterina) to become ‘Masters of Wisdom’ themselves, masters who assist human beings to become more spiritual and “Christlike” (*not Jesus Christ but Christ the Ascended Master who resides at Shamballa*).

“The ascended masters help us become aware of the Paths back to the Source. Paths that we can walk over to master the seven rays of our Christ consciousness that emerge from the white light.”

“The seven rays present seven paths to individual or personal Christhood. Seven masters have mastered identity by walking these paths, defined as the seven archetypes of Christhood. These particular ascended masters are called the chohans of the rays, which means lords of the rays. Chohan is a Sanskrit term for lord, and lord is equivalent to law; hence the chohan is the action of the law of the ray.

To be a Chohan on one of the seven rays means that this master defines the law on that ray; through him the energy of that ray emanating from the higher “Solar Logos” flows to mankind, to all who are evolving on that particular path.

As stated by Caterina: “Jesus said clearly that it (*Central Nucleus*) is a small number of people.”

“We do not go over 50 in number. Indeed, we are 49 to be exact (7 in each of the seven Ashrams, thus totaling 49). And why? Because the

Central Nucleus is divided into seven nuclei. Seven nuclei, at the head of which is one of the seven great archangels."

What Caterina presents as a teaching of "Jesus" is in accord with [theosophical teaching about the ashrams](#): Thus, according to [T. Subba Row](#) there are different types of Adepts, corresponding to the [Seven Rays](#) of the Logos:

"In the adept hierarchy, there are always seven classes of adepts, corresponding to the seven rays of the Logos."

The adepts are **advanced human beings** who have **put themselves into contact with, and under the influence of**, more advanced Cosmic Beings, Angels and Ascended Masters who together with them constitute a ruling planetary (and solar) brotherhood:

*"The Spiritual Hierarchy serving the Earth is made up of Cosmic Beings, Angels, and Ascended Masters. Ascended Masters are individuals who have attained the Victory of the Ascension (6th initiation) and are in "Heaven" (the upper Divine Octaves-Shamballa). The Great White Brotherhood, also known as the Brotherhood of Light, is made up of these, **as well as their unascended disciples** (and **adepts** in the lower octaves (lower planes or levels)."*

Without going into ever more cumbersome detail, **Vlasic and Caterina have simply put New Age Theosophy into Christian terms to better communicate esotericism to Christians foolish enough to listen to them.** Thus, the Cohans are called Archangels while *Shamballah* is referred to as the "*Central Nucleus*". The Seven *Cohans* or *Archangels* are Ascended Masters who along with their 49 most advanced students form the "*Central Nucleus*" which are really seven "*Ashrams*" or esoteric schools composed of highly developed New Age disciples preparing for their next initiation.

Above the Central Nucleus is a divine being known as Sanat Kumara (Lucifer or the "Planetary Logos"). The Central Nucleus is the sacred

dwelling through which the seven divine rays link the human mind and the human planet to the angelic mind of Sanat Kumara across a mystical bridge known in New Age lore as the “*antahkarana*” formed by prayer and meditation.

*“Kumara is an “Advanced Being” at the [Ninth level of initiation](#) who is regarded as the ‘Lord’ or ‘Regent’ of [Earth](#) and of the [humanity](#), and is thought to be the head of the [Spiritual Hierarchy](#) of Earth who dwells in [Shamballah](#) (also known as ‘The City of Enoch’)...Shamballah is a hidden land inhabited by a [hidden mystic brotherhood](#) whose members labor for the good of humanity. [Alice A. Bailey](#) claims Shamballa (her spelling) is an extra-dimensional or spiritual reality on the [etheric plane](#), a spiritual centre where the governing [deity](#) of [Earth](#), [Sanat Kumara](#), dwells as the highest [Avatar](#) of the Planetary [Logos](#) of Earth, and is said to be an expression of the Will of God” (Bailey, Alice A, *A Treatise on Cosmic Fire* 1932 Lucis Trust. 1925, p 753).*

Sanat Kumara is the founder of the Spiritual Hierarchy also known as the *Great Brotherhood of Light*, the *Great White Lodge*, or [Great White Brotherhood](#) of which, according to New Age Theosophy, Jesus is a part *albeit* at a lower rank of existence. As head of the Spiritual Hierarchy, *Sanat Kumara* is also known as the Ancient of Days. He is also one of the seven holy Kumaras who represent the seven rays on Venus. He supposedly came to the earth eons ago with a group of 144,000 spiritual beings to enlighten the earth during her darkest hours, a time when virtually all human being had turned their backs on God. Sanat long ago returned to the planet Venus. According to the ancient teachings, other Kumaras such as Guatama Buddha have also incarnated to assist humanity; Buddha was followed in succession by the Lord Maitreya and (then by) **Jesus**.

Jesus Christ is himself, just an **Ascended Master** – a man who became **divine** – a highly evolved human being who has passed through at least [four initiations](#) on his way to Godhead. According to Bailey,

“When the Master Jesus took the (fourth) Crucifixion Initiation,

*another crisis arose of equally great import, if not greater. The crisis was brought about because simultaneously with the crucifixion of the Master, the Head of the Hierarchy, the **Christ** (a being higher than Jesus – Lucifer or Sanat Kumara – the so-called “Lord of this World”), **took two initiations in one: the Resurrection Initiation and that of the Ascension.** These are the **fifth and sixth initiations, according to the Christian terminology.**”*

According to [Alice Bailey](#),

“The sixth initiation marks the point of attainment of the Christ, and brings the synthetic ray of the system under His control. We need to remember that initiation gives the initiate power on the rays, and not power over the rays, for this marks a very definite difference.

Moreover, [these initiations have their analogues in esoteric Freemasonry and are working their way into Catholic spirituality such as that lived and taught by Vlasic](#) and the Queen of Peace – Medjugorje Network of New Age Marian adepts (*not every Medjugorje pilgrim or even most, but those who enter Queen of Peace and Medjugorje prayer groups and cults such as Caritas in Birmingham, the Queen of Peace Network and many others that are offshoots of those formed by the rebellious friars of Medjugorje and others forming around the world*):

*“The question anent **initiation** is one that is coming more and more before the public. Before many centuries pass **the old mysteries will be restored, and an inner body will exist in the Church** (Caterina and Vlasic’s Central Nucleus) – the Church of the period, of which **the nucleus is already forming** (The Central Nucleus). The taking of the **first initiation** will, before so very long, be **the most sacred ceremony of the Church.** It will also hold a similar place in the [ritual of the Masons.](#)”*

This New Age profanation of the Church, liberal interpretation of the Gospels, heretical distortion of the Holy Trinity etc. acquire

perverted Marian and eschatological meaning in the context of Medjugorje: On Feb 28, 1982, the seers reported that Our Lady revealed to them that **Fr. Vlastic was providing them with good direction**. On this date Our Lady told the teenagers to:

“Thank Tomislav very much, for he is guiding you very well.”

On Wednesday, October 7, 1981 at a request from Fr. Tomislav,

“Should we found a community here just like that of Saint Francis of Assisi?”

The “Gospa” told the teens that the sexually active rebel priest (cited for **dubious doctrine, manipulation of consciences, mysticism, and disobedience**) was a saint:

“God has chosen Saint Francis (Vlastic) as His elected one. It would be good to imitate his life. In the meantime, we must realize what God orders us to do.”

Here Our Lady refers to Vlastic as another Saint Francis and that it would be good to imitate him. On Friday, June 3, 1983 Jakov, Vicka, and Ivanka asked the Gospa, **“What do you expect of Fr. Tomislav? Has he begun well?** her reply:

“Yes, it is good. Have him continue.”

This seems to imply that the Gospa of Medjugorje is a New Age devotee herself.

In closing, **it is necessary to make a distinction between the “seers” and their spiritual directors**. It is possible that the friars and others are perverting, distorting, and corrupting the Messages while leading the children astray in order to mitigate the impact of the Virgin Mary’s messages (if it is the Virgin Mary) and appearances at Medjugorje. Father Vlastic’s New Age aberrations could be a later development that have nothing to do with Medjugorje. However, his

disobedience, sexual amors, questionable bi-gender communities with the involvement of a Medjugorje seer (Marija, 1987), and his ties to a New Age seer (Caterina) who began communicating with extraterrestrial beings (fallen angels) as early as 1984, as well as Bishop Zanic's 1984 statement in which he referred to Vlastic as a "[mystifier and charismatic magician](#)", make this seem unlikely – in other words, at this juncture, it appears that Medjugorje is a fraud, perhaps a diabolical fraud. Nonetheless, the verdict is still out.

Neither Amoris Laetitia nor Argentinian Guidelines Prescind from Gospel or Tradition

[\(New Era World News\)](#)

PART ONE OF THIS TWO PART ARTICLE on *Amoris Laetitia* concluded that liberal minded bishops have been aided in their drafting and implementation of erroneous Pastoral Guidelines by a barrage of mistrust and confusion engendered by some traditionalists. If instead of contention, they had fallen in-line behind the pope, like Cardinal Mueller and other loyal bishops and Cardinals, if they had clarified the difference between dogmatic and pastoral theology and properly interpreted *Amoris Laetitia*, they would have significantly reduced the liberal ability to operate under the penumbra of confusion. **If instead of confusion, they would have promoted unity, the liberal bishops would have little room to operate.** Since both sides are actively engaged in attacking the pope, [Cardinal Mueller's](#) rebuke to those who are "talking too much"

can be taken to apply to both liberal and traditional prelates and laymen:

*“To all those who are talking too much, I urge them to study first the doctrine on the papacy and the episcopate of the two Vatican Councils. ... **The bishop, as teacher of the Word, must himself be the first to be well-formed so as not to fall into the risk of the blind leading the blind...**The Church can never justify a situation which is not in accordance with the will of God.”*

Consequently, Cardinal Muller concluded:

*“I urge everyone to reflect, studying the doctrine of the Church first, starting from the Word of God in Sacred Scripture, which is **very clear on marriage.** [...] **The Word of God is very clear and the Church does not accept the secularization of marriage. The task of priests and bishops is not that of creating confusion, but of bringing clarity.** One cannot refer **only to little passages present in Amoris Laetitia, but it has to be read as a whole,** with the purpose of making the Gospel of marriage and the family more attractive for persons. It is not Amoris Laetitia that has provoked a confused interpretation, but some confused interpretations of it.”*

This article will focus on the supposed liberal interpretations and the pope's supposed responses to them, responses that are being attacked by some traditionalists who are using them as fuel to throw on the fire they have ignited to burn papal heresy. What exactly are these acts of the pope that some traditionalists have adopted as an advanced strategy to forward their contention that the pope is a heretic? These acts include papal responses to the guidelines produced by the Bishops of Malta, the German Bishop's Conference, and especially the Bishops of Argentina and those of the Diocese of Rome, headed by the pope himself. It is claimed that in all

these dioceses, traditional church teaching about divorced and remarried couples living in adulterous relationships are being ignored and that divorced-remarried adulterers living in objective sin are being admitted to the sacraments.

While there is some truth to this contention; it is *not* true that the pope is supporting these initiatives nor is it true that any of the accusations about him are even correct.

Neither the Argentine Bishops nor the Bishop of Rome permit access to the Eucharist by divorced-remarried people living in adultery as the traditionalists and their erstwhile allies have loudly and boldly proclaimed. In other words, the traditionalists are wrong, wrong when they say the pope is supporting liberal guidelines, and wrong when they say the above mentioned guidelines teach heresy when in fact, some of them do not! Although a few do teach heresy, these are *not* supported by the pope; the ones that the pope does support such as the Argentine Bishops and those of his own diocese hold to the truth about marriage contrary to what many traditionalists and ideological news outlets have reported. They are either ignorant themselves or hide behind a veil of obfuscation (exactly what they accuse the pope of doing) dependent on other's ignorance, subversion of facts, and regular mis-reading of documents as will be shown document by document in the following.

The Argentine Bishops Guidelines

The issue with the Argentine Bishops comes down to the relationship between [Articles Five and Six](#) of their pastoral guidelines, which state:

5) *“Whenever feasible depending on the specific circumstances of a couple, especially when both partners are Christians walking the path of faith, a proposal may be made to resolve to live in continence. Amoris laetitia does not ignore the*

difficulties arising from this option (cf. footnote 329) and offers the possibility of having access to the sacrament of Reconciliation if the partners fail in this purpose (cf. footnote 364, recalling the teaching that Saint John Paul II sent to Cardinal W. Baum, dated 22 March, 1996).

*6) **In more complex cases, and when a declaration of nullity has not been obtained, the above mentioned option may not, in fact, be feasible.** Nonetheless, a path of discernment is still possible. If it is acknowledged that, in a concrete case, there are limitations that mitigate responsibility and culpability (cf. 301-302), especially when a person believes he/she would incur a subsequent fault by harming the children of the new union, *Amoris laetitia* offers the possibility of having access to the sacraments of Reconciliation and Eucharist (cf. footnotes 336 and 351).*

Those reading these words with a hard heart looking for error rather than truth come across a line that seems to support their contention that the pope is teaching heresy and they jump all over it; they simply become intellectually disconnected at their glee of finding what they think is an error and then become obstinately unreasonable. For example, in this case, they read Article Five which speaks of a "Proposal" to live in continence" and connect it to Article Six that says, "the above mentioned option (to live in continence) may not, in fact, be feasible." **Then they forget (or ignore) the two clauses preceding that statement and those that come after it.** They then jump to an unsubstantiated conclusion that adulterers can receive Holy Communion because Article Six ends by saying that:

"Amoris laetitia offers the possibility of having access to the sacraments of Reconciliation and Eucharist"

They are way too quick in making a connection between the two clauses that precede this concluding statement:

1. "The above mentioned option (to live in continence) may not, in fact, be feasible."

(Nonetheless)

2. "*Amoris laetitia* offers the possibility of having access to the sacraments of Reconciliation and Eucharist"

They think, or want to believe, that this means that a couple living in sin may have access to the the Eucharist WITHOUT the requirement to live in continence, which is a total perversion and misreading of the text.

Before analyzing the relationship between these two articles (and their perverted interpretation), it is necessary to point out that **the Argentine Bishops prefaced this section with a clear teaching about the need to meet sinners and help them find a way to Christ. There is always a path that leads to salvation and union with Christ;** it is the job of the pastor to lead penitents to this path and accompany them along it as good shepherds who know their sheep. Moreover, according to the Argentine Bishops and to Pope Francis, the penitents intention to change and to grow in Christ must be "sincere", what the Argentine Bishops refer to as "**righteous intention**", a firm resolve on the part of the penitent couple to "**devote their whole life to the light of the Gospel**". The couple **must** be penitent or there is no possibility of "accompaniment" – this is clear, but somehow missed by the dissenters; they blatantly disregard the most common English text – it is even in black and white: They must have a "**righteous intention**", a firm resolve to "**devote their whole life to the light of the**

Gospel”.

*“Pastoral accompaniment is an exercise of the “via caritas.” It is an invitation to follow “the way of Jesus, the way of mercy and reinstatement” (296). This itinerary requires the pastoral charity of the priest who **receives the PENITENT**, listens to him/her attentively and shows him/her the maternal face of the Church, while also accepting his/her **righteous intention** and good purpose **to devote his/her whole life to the light of the Gospel and to practise charity** (cf. 306).”*

In other words, it is accompaniment is a very difficult path and it is a rare couple that meets these specifications – **there cannot be a path of discernment leading to the Eucharist unless the above conditions are first met.**

Pope Francis ingrained these same requirements into *Amoris Laetitia* from which the Argentine Bishops gathered them. In the pope’s words,

*“For this discernment to happen, **the following conditions MUST NECESSARILY be present: humility, discretion and love for the Church and her teaching, in a sincere search for God’s will and a desire to make a more perfect response to it**”. These attitudes are **ESSENTIAL** for avoiding the grave danger of misunderstandings, such as the notion that any priest can quickly grant “exceptions”, or that some people can obtain sacramental privileges in exchange for favours” (300).*

Thus, according to the pope, couples must first of all be

- humble
- discrete
- they must love the Church
- love her teaching
- be sincerely in search of God’s will and

- desire to make a more perfect response to it.

These are NOT suggestions; they are NECESSARY REQUIREMENTS. As Pope Francis states, "These attitudes are ESSENTIAL". They are essential to avoid any misunderstanding or CONFUSION!

Moving from this general preface to Articles Five and Six, it becomes necessary to examine these two articles, the logic that connects them, and what they say and DO NOT say.

As was just stated above, papal detractors are way too quick in making a connection between the two clauses:

1. "The above mentioned option (to live in continence) may not, in fact, be feasible."

(Nonetheless)

2. "*Amoris laetitia* offers the possibility of having access to the sacraments of Reconciliation and Eucharist"

Nonetheless, they have hastily, rashly and erroneously connected these two clauses because without this rash and faulty connection they are unable to make their specious case.

However sincere their case might be, it suffers from a lack of recall, false propositions, and an inability to correctly connect the two articles thereby resulting in unsound conclusions.

Article Five pertains to a couple that has been meeting the above bulleted requirements necessary to be invited to a path of discernment and continence leading to possible reception of the Eucharist. Because such a couple has been observed by their pastor to be making progress walking with Christ, he is encouraged to invite them further, further along a path that can lead to Holy Communion. This path is made possible by a proposal followed by a **sincere** vow to live in continence as Pope John Paul II spoke of in [*Familiaris Consortio*](#). This much is facile and very clear. Apparently, the detractors get

confused when the case becomes more complex, as is the reality in many pastoral situations, complex situations that priests will encounter and must learn to deal with mercifully and with compassion as good shepherds rather than as judgmental myopes limited to seeing everything in black and white thereby facilitating easy *albeit* alienating judgements that turn people away from God rather than toward Him as Pope Francis has stated numerous times.

Looking at Article Six, it is clear that the Argentine Bishops have moved from a more simple scenario (Article Five) to a more complex one. They even alert the reader to the fact: Article Six begins with the words, "in more complex cases."

Then they proceed to tell the reader exactly the type of complex case they are referring to, *viz.*, a case that involves married couples involved in an adulterous relationship who have NOT received an annulment and who also have children. These are two realities *not* mentioned in Article Five, realities that, as they indicate, make the case more complex.

Thus, **we are invited to examine the complexity and how it affects the couple before making a snap judgement that would preclude them from eventually being admitted to the sacraments.** The Argentine Bishops are NOT saying that these complexities excuse a couple from a vow of continence necessary to be admitted to Holy Communion as the dissenters have weakly argued.

They are saying that because the case is more complex, different dimensions need to be considered before a process of discernment can be entered into according to the above bulleted GENERAL CRITERIA necessary for ALL cases of discernment. The bulleted criteria are *general and always required*; they are NOT to be forgotten. Nonetheless, there is a more potent point to be made: **The reason the case is more complex is due to the lack of nullity and the additional presence of children.**

Lack of Nullity

Lack of nullity means that the adulterous partners are both married to someone else – they are still bound by marriage vows to their real husband and wife. Because annulments have *not* been obtained, there is no possibility of this relationship ending in marriage, which the *Final Report of the Synod of Bishops* ([Renatio Finalis](#)) included as a goal of discernment:

*54. “When a couple in an irregular union reaches a noteworthy stability through a public bond – and is characterized by deep affection, responsibility towards the children and the ability to overcome trials – this can be seen as an **opportunity, where possible, to lead the couple to celebrating the Sacrament of Matrimony.** A different case occurs, however, when persons live together without a desire for a future marriage, but instead have the decided intention not to establish any institutionally recognized relationship” (they cannot be invited to walk a path of deeper discernment).*

*“Hopefully, dioceses will promote various means of discernment for these people and to involve them in the community to help and encourage them to grow and eventually make a conscious, coherent choice. **Couples need to be told about the possibility of having recourse to a process of a declaration of nullity regarding their marriage.**”*

Pope Francis repeats this theme in *Amoris Laetitia*(293, 294):

*‘When a couple in an irregular union attains a noteworthy stability through a public bond – and is characterized by deep affection, responsibility towards the children and the ability to overcome trials – **this can be seen as an opportunity, where possible, to lead them to celebrate the***

sacrament of Matrimony”.

*“Whatever the case, **“ALL these situations require a constructive response seeking to transform them into opportunities that can lead to the full reality of marriage and family in conformity with the Gospel.”***

The situation discussed in **Article Six violates this basic stipulation, viz., it cannot be open to sacramental marriage because the couple has not obtained an annulment.** Moreover, the relationship referred to in Article Six is ridden with a much deeper scandal than the situation in Five. Because the couple in Six are still married to others, most everyone in their parish community is aware of the fact. Thus, **the level of scandal is exceedingly high, esp. if the situation is uncorrected.** Little children looking on learn to accept this situation as normal and valid and thus are lured to future sin themselves:

“But he that shall scandalize one of these little ones that believe in me, it were better for him that a millstone should be hanged about his neck, and that he should be drowned in the depth of the sea” ([Matt 18:6](#)).

Moreover, by abandoning their marital partners, these men and women are also responsible for the adultery committed by their spouses and responsible for those who commit adultery with their spouses – they are spreading a spiritual and moral epidemic:

“Every one that putteth away his wife, and marrieth another, committeth adultery: and he that marrieth her that is put away from her husband, committeth adultery” ([Luke 16:18](#)).

Clearly Article Six is significantly more complex. The reason

why the above proposal of continence *cannot* be made to the adulterous couple is because the two SHOULD NOT EVEN BE LIVING WITH EACH OTHER – THEY SHOULD SEPARATE! Why, because there is no possibility of marriage as both the pope and bishops stated above! They should NOT be encouraged to continue living with each other; they should be reconciled with their spouses.

However, if reconciliation proves impossible, the second complicating factor, **the reality of children, might make it necessary for the adulterous pair to continue living with each other** for the good of the children who need both a mother and a father *esp.* if the children are theirs. We are talking about people who meet the bulleted requirements not every Joe Blow out there. If the couple are living on adultery and have not obtained an annulment, they cannot embrace the requirements for discernment; they cannot make a sincere promise to follow Christ nor can their relationship ever end in marriage; in this case they should be told to separate. However, if they have children, it might be necessary to remain together because children are a mitigating factor in their decision to live together despite all the other objective moral aberrants that make their relationship sinful.

Thus, Article Six does refer to Article Five. But the reason the proposal to live in continence made in Five might *not* be feasible in Six is because both partners are already married and do not have an annulment. However, there are mitigating circumstances for them to remain together (**not mitigating adultery but their moral responsibility for living together**) – the existence of biological children that seems to necessitate that they remain together. Thus, when the Guidelines state that some civilly remarried couples who can't adhere to the Church's teaching of "living like brothers and sisters," who have complex circumstances, and who can't obtain a declaration of nullity for their first marriage, might undertake a "journey of discernment," and arrive at the recognition that in their particular case, there are limitations that "diminish

responsibility and culpability.” it is referring to living together because of the children! If the Guidelines were interpreted as the dissenters insist *viz.*, as a dispensation to keep sinning and also be admitted to the sacraments two problems arise:

1. First, this type of interpretation does damage to the text as a systematic whole, as Cardinal Mueller stated about *Amoris Laetitia*, the text must be read as a complete WHOLE. If this is remembered, there is a built in check against making a too hasty and faulty interpretation that prescind from the Gospel and the bulleted guidelines necessary for a process of discernment to begin according to the Argentine Bishops. The way the dissenters want to interpret *Amoris Laetitia*, and the Guidelines that follow, prescind from the Gospel and from the essential requirements for discernment, which both texts caution against.

2. If the Guidelines are read as an excuse for coitus, the remainder does not make sense. **Why would children be hurt if their parents stopped engaging in sexual relations in the privacy of their own room apart from the children, who might *not* even know about them.**

On the other hand, the children would certainly know about and experience the loss of a parent from their home (if asked to separate-as would *normally* be the case); that would harm them. This makes sense. This is what Article Six is referring to. A priest might *not* be able to make a proposal to live in continence to an already married and adulterous couple causing public scandal because he should be telling them to separate due to the danger they are putting themselves and their partners in, that is, contributing to the sin of their actual spouses as well as the grave scandal they are causing by living together. Moreover, even if they are permitted to live together for the sake of the children, a proposal to live in continence might not be appropriate because they have no intention of changing; they might not be living the life of

the Gospel or practicing their faith seriously or any other number of many possibilities. The bottom line is that they should NOT be living together and thus such a proposal cannot be made unless there is a mitigating reason for them to remain together such as the existence of children. Even then, a proposal to live in continence, though possible, might not be made to them if they fail to meet the bulleted requirements above. Nonetheless, a path does remain open to them, esp if they decide to get serious about their faith and live in continence as brother and sister.

Thus, [Pope Francis teaches](#) in *Amoris Laetitia* (298):

*“The Church acknowledges situations “where, for serious reasons, **such as the children’s upbringing**, a man and woman cannot satisfy the obligation to separate”.*

Then in the footnote to this sentence, he adds:

“In such situations, many people, knowing and accepting the possibility of living “as brothers and sisters” which the Church offers them.”

[Pope Francis also applauded the Argentine Bishops](#) Pastoral Guidelines by saying that they corresponded with what he is trying to teach:

*“The document is very good and thoroughly specifies the meaning of chapter VIII of *Amoris laetitia*. There are no further interpretations. I am confident that it will do much good.”*

It was following this statement that the dissenters jumped all over both the bishops and the pope saying that they taught and he supported their heresy and thus had intended heresy in *Amoris Laetita* all along. As has been shown, this is *not* only an unfair stretch, it is an untrue judgement, a judgement that

if *not* corrected will come back to haunt those audacious enough to claim they know more than the pope and thus should be teaching him, audacious enough to call the Vicar of Christ a heretic. Perhaps the shoe is on the other foot as is often the case for those who make it a habit of condemning others; apparently this is the case.

How is it that two people can read the same document and come to such divergent understandings? I would like to suggest that it has to do with the spirit with which a person approaches papal writings. If the reader is mistrusting, if he does not like this pope, if he has been conditioned by the negativity of others and allows them to make claims with little or no evidence *etc*, than his approach to the document is likely conditioned by negative affect.

If on the other hand, the reader loves both Christ and His Vicar, has confidence in the papacy and trusts that the pope is speaking the truth, then the document is approached with a spirit of confidence and love. Men and women approaching papal writings (or any writings) with a positive spirit are *not* trying to catch the pope in error, not looking everywhere for evidence of heresy thereby missing the beauty of the forest because they are looking for fault on every tree. The later are no better than those Jesus condemned as blind guides; they claim to see and want to correct everyone else's blindness. Their pride reached such heights that they even thought Jesus was a heretic Himself. They dare to call others prideful and blind but fail to see that it takes a tremendous amount of pride to call the Vicar of Christ a heretic and to dismiss the Prefect of the CDF as a school boy whom they believe in their audacity should be learning from them. People such as these, people who accuse others of pride and spiritual blindness, those who believe the Vicar of Christ is an arrogant liberal blind heretic approach papal writings infected with a good dose of their own pride. The prefect of the CDF assures the people of God that *Amoris Laetitia* is

faithful to long standing Catholic tradition and to the Sacred Scriptures, but the detractors say that he does not know what he is talking about; they look at the same document he is looking at and see only error when he sees systematic truth; they fail to see plain black and white English (but insist on black and white pastoral theology) how can this be?

The Gospel of Luke provides insight into such a phenomenon. In this Gospel, both Zacharias and the Virgin Mary are visited by the Archangel Gabriel, both are presented with miracles involving the birth of a son (Son). Both ask the same question, (How can this be?). One, however, is punished for asking this question while the other is blessed. How can this be? **It is all about their attitude of Heart.** The Virgin Mary trusted God and thus believed what Gabriel was conveying to her. Her question was simply one of how exactly this miracle was going to take place since she was a vowed perpetual virgin. Her question is not one of doubt or disbelief or incredulity. Her question was an innocent reflection on how God was going to accomplish this miracle as indicated by the fact that once the Angel told her, she assented: "Be it done unto me..." Zachariah, on the other hand, did not trust and had trouble believing that a son could be born to him and Elizabeth in their old age; he had so much trouble believing that he dared to ridicule an Archangel (perhaps God Himself) for which he was punished for his disbelief:

"And behold, thou shalt be dumb, and shalt not be able to speak until the day wherein these things shall come to pass, because thou hast not believed my words, which shall be fulfilled in their time" ([Luke 1:20](#)).

This case before is is similar. Some, like true devotees of the Virgin Mary, wisely, yet humbly, measure all things in the love of Christ with a trusting and joyful heart: "My spirit rejoices in God my saviour" ([Luke 1:47](#)). They have little or no trouble believing. Papal detractors, on the other hand, are

riddled with all kinds of trouble, constantly looking for bad in others, constantly complaining about how bad the Curia and pope are, how sinners should be punished etc. *Like Zacharias, they have no problem belittling the authority of God's highest ministers.* They are weighed down by negativity and habituated to looking for all that is bad rather than searching out the good in all things. Preoccupied with such thoughts, they become laden with misery and doubts that enable them to ridicule others, even the Vicar of Christ, Christ whom the Pharisees had no scruple correcting for his supposed error.

As Christ, so too His Vicar; as the pharisees, so those who follow in their negativity, legalism and supposed ritual purity.

They seem to have forgotten the good news and instead think it their duty to inform the rest of the Body of Christ, just how bad things are. The mission of the Church is *not* to renounce, but to pronounce, to pronounce the good news of the Gospel.

"The Spirit of the Lord is upon me. Wherefore he hath anointed me to preach the gospel to the poor, he hath sent me to heal the contrite of heart, To preach deliverance to the captives, and sight to the blind, to set at liberty them that are bruised, to preach the acceptable year of the Lord, and the day of reward" ([Luke 4:18-19](#)).

The mission of the bishops is NOT to renounce the papacy but to teach the NATIONS, to fill them with the Holy Spirit, the spirit of Love and Truth

"Going therefore, teach ye all nations; baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost" ([Matt 28:19](#)).

Rather than do this, papal detractors spend their time looking for papal error, when in truth, they are the ones spreading error. As demonstrated above, they are so busy distorting

document by leaving clauses/phrases out, skipping contrary evidence, forgetting general statements, adding occasional vindictive to spice it up in order to vindicate their false supposition etc. They are so busy with these things, that they have difficulty seeing plain truth, the same type of difficulty the pharisees had when TRUTH looked them right in the face. Instead of plain truth, they saw (see) error and then try and pawn it off on the rest of the Church, try to convince anyone silly enough to accept their gross distortions and weakly supported diatribe, diatribe they concoct in order to justify ludicrous assertions such as the the pope is a heretic. When they broadcast such irreverent and blasphemous ideas, simply ask them for corroborating evidence, real formal evidence, primary documents etc. If they are able to produce any, be sure to review them carefully and compare them to the originals. If the reader habitually does such things, he/she will soon find out how distortion takes place and where the confusion is actually coming from. Lord have mercy!

NOTE:

1. The detractors like to point out that the Apostle Paul corrected Peter publicly so they should do the same. What they fail to tell you is that the rebuke given by Paul was a different species altogether from the rebuke they are advocating. Paul's correction of Peter was a pastoral correction, it was *not* dogmatic, Paul corrected Peter for sitting with the Jews. Is it a sin to sit with Jews? On the other hand, the correction that the dissenters are attempting is DOGMATIC; heresy is a sin against the faith. Paul's correction is NOT applicable; it is a different species altogether. Paul was not accusing Peter of heresy, nor was Catherine's correction of Gregory XI.
2. The author had intended to cover the Diocese of Rome Guidelines as well as those of the Bishops of Malta,

however internal policies governing article length are about to be exceeded; therefore, an additional article will have to be included following Easter Monday.

Is Russia Becoming a Christian Nation Again – Decide for Yourself

[New Era World News](#)

-- TIMELINE OF EVENTS INDICATING THE PROMISED "CONVERSION OF RUSSIA" --

May 13 1982

Feast Day of

Our Lady of Fatima

Pope John Paul II assailed by an assassin's bullet in St. Peter's Square

<http://www.nydailynews.com/news/world/pope-john-paul-ii-shot-1981-article-1.2212919>

March 25, 1984

Feast of the Annunciation

In Fulfillment of Request by the Mother of God at Fatima, Pope John Paul II Consecrates World (including Russia) to the Immaculate Heart of Mary to which Sister Lucia, the sole surviving seer responded: "it has been fulfilled."

<http://wafusa.org/the-consecration-of-russia/>

May 13, 1984

Feast Day of

Our Lady of Fatima

An explosion at the Soviets' Severomorsk Naval Base destroys two-thirds of all the missiles stockpiled for the Soviets' Northern Fleet. The blast also destroys workshops needed to maintain the missiles as well as hundreds of scientists and technicians. Western military experts called it the worst naval disaster the Soviet Navy has suffered since WWII.

<http://www.nytimes.com/1984/07/11/world/soviet-naval-blast-called-crippling.html>

April 26, 1986

Chernobyl nuclear reactor accident

May 12, 1988

Vigil of Our Lady of Fatima

As thousands prayed the Rosary at Fatima, an explosion wrecked the only factory that made the rocket motors for the Soviets' deadly SS 24 long-range missiles, which carry ten nuclear bombs each.

<http://www.patriotheadquarters.com/russias-k-project-emp-threat/>

Nov 9, 1989

Fall of Berlin Wall

Nov-Dec 1989

Peaceful revolutions in Czechoslovakia, Romania, Bulgaria and Albania

Year of 1990

East and West Germany are unified

Solidarity brings end of Communism in Poland – Walesa elected President -Catholic renewal begins

August 19, 1991: Queenship of Mary

Hardline communists attempt to overthrow Gorbachev on the 74th anniversary of Her August appearance at Fatima. The attempt failed and Gorbachev whom Sr. Lucia said was instrumental in the fall of communism was kept in office and the hardliners out.

<http://www.unitypublishing.com/Apparitions/FatimaBook.html>

December 8, 1991

Feast of the Immaculate Conception

The Communist Era vanished when the presidents of Russia, Ukraine, and Byelorussia announced its formal dissolution on Dec. 8, 1991, the Feast of the Immaculate Conception of the Virgin Mary

http://www.apostoladomundialdefatima.org/html/consacration_imm_heart_of_mar.html

Dec. 25, 1991

Christmas Day

Communist flag of USSR taken down for last time from atop the Kremlin. Mikhail Gorbachev formally resigned as President of USSR

<http://www.nytimes.com/learning/general/onthisday/big/1225.html>

January 1, 1992

Feast of the Mother of God

Russia is reborn as a sovereign nation

http://www.apostoladomundialdefatima.org/pdf/Consecration_Fatima_ALO__corrected_.pdf

May 13, 2000

Our Lady of Fatima

Pope Benedict, then Cardinal Joseph Ratzinger, presented the official interpretation or theological commentary on the Third Secret of Fatima

http://www.vatican.va/roman_curia/congregations/cfaith/documents/rc_con_cfaith_doc_20000626_message-fatima_en.html

August 28, 2004

The icon of Our Lady of Kazan brought it to Moscow and handed it to Patriarch Alexy during a divine liturgy at the Moscow Kremlin Assumption Cathedral

The sacred Icon had been in the possession of the World Apostolate of Fatima who transferred it to Pope John Paul II

<http://www.interfax-religion.com/?act=news&div=3036>

May 13, 2005

Our Lady of Fatima

Pope Benedict dispenses with waiting period for beatification of Pope John Paul II. On the feast of *Our Lady of Fatima*. It was on this date that John Paul II was struck by an assassin's bullet in fulfillment of a Fatima prophecy. By John Paul II's assessment:

"It was a mother's hand that guided the bullet's path", and permitted that "the dying Pope... stopped on the threshold of death".

<http://www.pewresearch.org/fact-tank/2014/04/24/papal-saints-often-a-given-now-extremely-rare/>

May 25, 2005

"The Russian Orthodox Church actively supports the development of interaction with the Catholic Church.

"We agree on a majority of the questions that the Christian world faces today. It is well known that both Churches are very concerned about the expulsion of religious values from the life of modern society and the need to preserve Christian ethical standards in it" Our cooperation is absolutely necessary. It is awaited by millions of people – believers and spiritual seekers alike".

Patriarch Kirill

<http://orthodoxeurope.org/page/14/95.aspx>

October 7, 2005

Feast of Our Lady of the Rosary

“The World Apostolate of Fatima has been established as a public association of the faithful for the universal Church. A public ceremony was held at the Vatican to celebrate the importance of this elevation”. It is with great joy that we celebrate this moment of the consignment of the decree of establishment and approval of the Statutes of the World Apostolate of Fatima”.

<http://wafusa.org/wp-content/pdf/WAF-DECREE.pdf>

<http://www.zenit.org/en/articles/world-apostolate-of-fatima-sees-status-upgraded>

September 23, 2007

The Christian Faith (Orthodoxy 101) to be Taught in the PUBLIC SCHOOLS of Russia

http://www.nytimes.com/2007/09/23/world/europe/23russia.html?pagewanted=all&_r=0

Feb. 13, 2008

Pope Benedict XVI announced that he would dispense with the five-year waiting period established by Canon Law to open the cause of beatification of Sister Lucia, the third of three Fatima seers

http://www.catholicnewsagency.com/news/beatification_process_for_sister_lucia_opened_new_writings_to_be_published/

July 31, 2008

Russian Church compares current Christianity in Europe to the epoch of USSR militant atheism

<http://www.interfax-religion.com/?act=news&div=5031>

June 30, 2009

Gambling Casinos to be Shut Down Throughout Russia

<https://www.theguardian.com/world/2009/jun/29/russia-bans-gambling-casino-putin>

February 5, 2010

After being elevated to Patriarch of Moscow and all of Russia, Patriarch Kirill stated that,

"We (together with the Roman Catholic Church) have similar positions on many problems facing Christians in the modern world. They include aggressive secularization, globalization, and the erosion of the traditional moral principles. "It should be noted that on these issues Pope Benedict XVI has taken a stance close to the Orthodox one"

Patriarch Kirill

<http://www.interfax-religion.com/?act=news&div=6889>

May 14, 2010

While presiding as pope over mass at the Fatima Shrine, he revealed his personal conviction that the Fatima message has relevancy to the development of the modern world, "*we would be mistaken to think that the prophetic mission of Fatima is complete*".

He concluded by praying for the fulfillment of the Fatima message and the "Triumph of the Immaculate Heart of Mary"

<http://www.catholicnewsagency.com/news/fatimas-prophetic-mission-not-complete-pope-declares-on-solemnity/>

Summer 2010

Construction of 200 Orthodox churches in Moscow by the year 2020

<https://calvertjournal.com/photography/show/3469/Church-building-Moscow-suburbs-program-200>

Nov. 30, 2010

Medvedev was present at the Church of Nativity of the Mother of God in the Grand Kremlin Palace to deliver a personal message to Patriarch Kirill of Moscow and all Russia:

"I would like to inform you that today I have signed a law on religious property return to religious organizations. It is a serious law that was long discussed and coordinated"

<http://www.interfax-religion.com/?act=news&div=7969>

Dec. 23, 2010

Patriarch Kirill said A total of 23,000 Orthodox churches have

been rebuilt in Russia in the past 20 years. “Nothing of the kind has happened in any country at any time in history; This has been happening against the backdrop of all social, political and economic confrontations.

https://sputniknews.com/art_living/20101203161616486/

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=jKccSe0wkws>

June 1 2010

July 28 marked as a national holiday by president of Russia in commemoration of St Vladimir and the Baptism of the Rus (988) as a Christian nation and its Ancient Christian patrimony.

“The continual work of the Russian Orthodox Church will effect the revival of Christianity in our nation. Thanks to the Orthodox faith Russian culture through the years has acquired Biblical values on which the system of moral ideals for our nation is built”

“When we celebrated the millennial anniversary of the Baptism of Russia twenty years ago it was the beginning of churches being rebuilt and the restoration of the integrity of the Orthodox Church”

Demitri Medvedev

<https://xlerma.wordpress.com/tag/medvedev/>

Jan. 14, 2008

Russian President Vladimir Putin said the government is indebted to the Russian Orthodox Church and has promised to facilitate the revival of religion in Russia. “That the state will repay its debt to the Russian Orthodox Church and other traditional denominations and its debt to the Russian people”. “The Russian government is indebted to the Russian Orthodox Church” and he “promised to facilitate the revival of religion in Russia” and expressed his sincere hope to “repay” the debt”.

Vladimir Putin

<http://www.interfax-religion.com/?act=news&div=4150>

“In January 2010 Putin announced that the Russian government would provide \$64 million (two billion rubles) to restore ROC (Russian Orthodox Church) holy sites, monasteries, and churches destroyed by the Soviet government”.

January 7, 2008

“The Russian Orthodox Church contributes to the promotion of moral values in society. One should not completely draw a line between the culture and the church. Of course, by law in our country the church is separate from the state. But in the soul and the history of our people it’s all together. It always has been and always will be”.

Vladimir Putin

<https://books.google.com/books?id=kqt0CwAAQBAJ&pg=PT344&lpg=PT344&dq=%22But+in+the+soul+and+the+history+of+our+people+it%E2%80%99s+all+together.%22+Putin&source=bl&ots=J-UUulUqlu&sig=DlbhUNxcc4a1v5pafkWyS85M1ZM&hl=en&sa=X&ved=0ahUKEwjCqNTkxd7PAhVDZCYKHR6uDbkQ6AEIKDAC#v=onepage&q=%22But%20in%20the%20soul%20and%20the%20history%20of%20our%20people%20it%E2%80%99s%20all%20together.%22%20Putin&f=false>

Nov. 13, 2009

Mass media review: “Christianity ended the cold war peacefully. *Religion brought down communism and it is religion which will help us resist naked capitalism, too*”

October 7, 2010 “Patriarch Kirill emphasized the personal involvement and active support by Vladimir Putin who has facilitated “good relations of trust” between the Church and the government. The Patriarch expressed his appreciation for “full assistance rendered by the government to recover (the) cultural heritage of Orthodox Russia and its contribution in spiritual education and development of citizens.

<http://www.interfax-religion.com/?act=news&div=7782>

April 8, 2011

Moscow Patriarchate: Russia's mission is to become the Holy Rus

June 27, 2011

Patriarch Kirill: European population will die if it fails to come back to its spiritual sources

June 2011

President Medvedev signs Pro-life Bill and The World Congress of Families held the world's first demographic summit – "Moscow Demographic Summit: Family and the Future of Humankind" – at the Russian State Social University (RSSU), June 29-30.

<http://www.lifenews.com/2011/07/15/russian-president-medvedev-signs-pro-life-bill-on-abortion-risks/>

<http://newcoldwar.org/the-political-church-alliance-to-end-abortion-in-russia/>

August 31, 2011

Course of *Basics of Religion and Secular Ethics* is likely to be introduced in all Russian [schools](#) next year.

<http://www.interfax-religion.com/?act=news&div=8691>

Nov. 7, 2011

Medvedev calls rapid revival of Orthodox Christianity in Russia a miracle.

<http://theorthodoxchurch.info/blog/news/medvedev-calls-rapid-revival-of-orthodox-christianity-in-russia-a-miracle/>

Medvedev: Orthodoxy Russia's guardian of "indisputable truths"

<http://www.interfax-religion.com/?act=news&div=8857>

Russian Orthodox Church will continue crafting "symphony" with state.

<http://www.interfax-religion.com/?act=news&div=8860>

"Patriarch Kirill calls Russian Church revival unique event in

world history”

<http://www.interfax-religion.com/?act=news&div=8856>

Feb. 14, 2011

Pope-Medvedev meeting will help protect moral values worldwide – Vatican

<https://newsessentials.wordpress.com/2011/02/15/pope-medvedev-meeting-will-help-protect-moral-values-worldwide-vatican/>

Feb. 8, 2012

Prime Minister Vladimir Putin has instructed the Education and Science Ministry to organize the training of [school](#) teachers in the fundamentals of religious culture and secular ethics.

<http://www.interfax-religion.com/?act=news&div=9048>

April 17, 2012

Pro-church, anti-gay rally held in central Moscow

<http://www.interfax-religion.com/?act=news&div=9274>

May 4, 2012

Church calls on believers to unite for country’s revival

<http://theorthodoxchurch.info/blog/news/church-calls-on-believers-to-unite-for-countrys-revival/>

May 21, 2012

The gay pride parade which was due to take place in Kiev on Sunday has been canceled over fears for the safety of its participants.

<https://www.kyivpost.com/article/content/ukraine-politics/gay-pride-parade-in-kyiv-cancelled-1-127943.html>

May 23, 2012

Moscow law banning homosexuality propaganda amongst minors.

<http://www.rferl.org/a/russia-homosexuality-law-duma-protest/25013537.html>

May 28, 2012

Moscow police detained about 40 people in Moscow on Sunday as LGBT activists attempted to hold unauthorized demonstrations.

<http://www.cnn.com/2012/05/27/world/europe/russia-rally-arrests/>

October 1, 2012

The approval rating of Patriarch Kirill is the highest in Russia (69%)

<http://theorthodoxchurch.info/blog/news/the-approval-rating-of-patriarch-kirill-is-the-highest-in-russia/>

February 8, 2012

“That it would be one of the tasks of Russia’s foreign policy to defend Christians in other countries who are persecuted for their faith. *‘You needn’t have any doubt that that’s the way it will be,’* Putin said at a meeting with Russian religious leaders when Metropolitan Hilarion, foreign relations chief of the Russian Orthodox Church, expressed hope that Russia’s government would stand up for persecuted Christian communities abroad”.

Vladimir Putin

<http://www.interfax-religion.com/?act=news&div=9050>

January 25, 2013

The Russian Duma passed the bill banning the propaganda of homosexuality among minors.

<http://www.reuters.com/article/us-russia-gay-idUSBRE90000T20130125>

February 1, 2013

Medvedev wants stronger relations between state, church, society.

“I wish for the special relationship now established between the Russian Orthodox Church, the state, and the entire society to grow stronger and serve for the good of our Fatherland”

Dmitri Medvedev

<http://www.interfax-religion.com/?act=news&div=10247>

February 3, 2013

“Clerics not just do their [job](#), they serve the Almighty, they serve the Lord, they serve people. It is impossible to intimidate them. Yet they obviously need our support and assistance. And this support and assistance must be efficient”

Vladimir Putin

<http://www.interfax-religion.com/print.php?act=news&id=10242>

February 4, 2013

“It is my deep conviction that we need to make every effort to boost collaboration between Church and State in key areas such as addressing urgent [social problems](#), promoting antireligious and interethnic dialogue, and imbuing young people with respect for the extremely rich historical, cultural and spiritual legacy of the peoples of Russia.”

Vladimir Putin

<http://www.interfax-religion.com/?act=news&div=10251>

Sept. 4 , 2013

Pope Francis communicates to the G-20 though President Putin with a plea for peace n Syria.

https://w2.vatican.va/content/francesco/en/letters/2013/documents/papa-francesco_20130904_putin-g20.html

By Nov. 2013

In the countries of the former Soviet Union, in particular in Russia, Ukraine, Belorussia and Moldavia, an unprecedented religious revival is underway. In the Russian Orthodox Church over the past 25 years there have been built or restored from ruins more than 25,000 churches. This means that a thousand churches a year have been opened, i.e., three churches a day.

Metropolitan Hilarion Alfeyev, October 30

<http://insidethevatican.com/news/newsflash/russians-coming>

November 25, 2013

Abortion Adds Banned Throughout Russia

<http://www.lifenews.com/2013/11/25/putin-signs-law-banning-abortion-ads-as-it-decimates-russias-population/>

February 7, 2015

1. The Ministry of Health in Russia has signed an agreement with the Russian Orthodox Church that includes prevention of abortion and provision of palliative care. The agreement signed by Health Minister Veronika Skvortsova and Patriarch Kirill, the head of the Russian Orthodox Church was published on the website of the [Synodal Department for ROC](#) [Russian Orthodox Church] Church Charity and Social Service. Article 9 of the 21 article agreement establishes cooperation “on the protection of maternal and child health, including reproductive health, promotion of family values and prevention of abortion.”

The agreement includes joint actions with medical institutions for the

“creation of crisis pregnancy centers at hospitals with the participation of psychologists and participation of representatives of religious organizations of the Russian Orthodox Church in advising women who are planning to terminate the pregnancy, in medical institutions”

and for the provision of space for

“posting information of religious organizations of the Russian Orthodox Church on the stands in medical institutions.”

Additionally, the two parties will also undertake

“joint efforts to provide assistance and support to pregnant women whose prenatal diagnosis indicate to the malformation of the fetus, as well as mothers who give birth to a child with developmental disabilities.”

Under Article 5, the Orthodox Church will cooperate with the Health Ministry in the preparation of health professionals by

providing formative instruction on the spiritual foundations of medical activities and by facilitating the interaction of medical organizations with organizations of the Russian Orthodox Church.

2. The Russian State Duma is considering legislation on abortion that includes limiting funding for abortion to only those that are considered medically necessary. The bill is designed to help reduce the number of Russian children destroyed through the violence of abortion.

The legislation would ban private abortion clinics and over-the-counter sale of abortion inducing medication would only be available through a doctor's prescription. Women considering abortion would be given ultrasounds.

In response to the proposed legislation, the **Parliamentary Assembly of the Council of Europe** tabled [introduced] Written Declaration 594 which states:

We the undersigned members of the Council of Europe Parliamentary Assembly are strongly concerned about the three draft laws submitted to the State Duma of the Russian Federation aiming to severely restrict access of women to abortion. They aim:

1. to require women to visualise and listen to the heartbeats of the foetus before being given permission to access a legal abortion;
2. exclude coverage of abortion from the Obligatory Medical Insurance;
3. to prohibit the sale of safe medication that terminate pregnancies.

The World Health Organization (WHO) has clearly stated that "ultrasound scanning is not routinely required for abortion". It only serves to emotionally manipulate women. Excluding

insurance coverage for a service that only women need is discriminatory and will affect poor, rural women and women in vulnerable situations. The State medical system must additionally ensure the availability of various methods of abortion suitable at different stages of pregnancy. These proposed measures will lead to backstreet abortions and increase maternal mortality and morbidity rates and are an affront to women's rights.

PNCI (Russian Duma) notes that the Members of the Council of Europe Parliamentary Assembly in their rush to object to the pro-life provisions with worn-out pro-abortion arguments are forgetting that the International Conference on Population and Development Programme of Action states in section 8.2 "Any measures or changes related to abortion within the health system can only be determined at the national or local level according to the national legislative process."

<http://www.patriarchia.ru/db/text/4124569.html> (translate into English)

Dec.18, 2015

The International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) has declared that it has found no military use of Iran's nuclear technology; so far, those who claimed that Tehran was developing nuclear weapons have been blatantly lying, US columnist Jim W. Dean notes. The Iranian nuclear threat hoax has been nothing less than a large-scale coordinated propaganda campaign, which brought together experts, prominent media figures and intelligence agencies, US columnist and managing editor of Veterans Today Jim W. Dean notes.

Feb. 13, 2016

Patriarch Kirill and Pope Francis met in Havana, Cuba for a historic meeting between the two churches, pledging to come together for the future of Christianity. "We spoke as brothers, we have the same baptism, we are bishops, we spoke of our churches,"

At the conclusion of their meeting, the two religious leaders signed a joint declaration which stated "We are not competitors but brothers, and this concept must guide our mutual actions as well as those directed to the outside world."

The document also addressed the problems of capitalism. "consumerism, the growing inequality in the distribution of material goods increases the feeling of the injustice of the international order that has emerged."

Both leaders expressed their concern over the decreasing significance of the traditional family, and stated their positions on euthanasia and abortion.

The document reads. "In affirming the foremost value of religious freedom, we give thanks to God for the current unprecedented renewal of the Christian faith in Russia, as well as in many other countries of Eastern Europe, formerly dominated for decades by atheist regimes. Today, the chains of militant atheism have been broken and in many places Christians can now freely confess their faith."

With the Syrian conflict threatening to push the world to the brink of war, the document calls on all Christians to pray for peace. "We exhort all Christians and all believers of God to pray fervently to the providential Creator of the world to protect His creation from destruction and not permit a new world war."

http://en.radiovaticana.va/news/2016/02/12/joint_declaration_of_pope_francis_and_patriarch_kirill/1208117

Feb. 18, 2016

In an attempt to defend Christians in the Middle East and other parts of the world where they're being persecuted, "It's important to join efforts [with Russia] to save Christianity in all regions [of the world] where it's oppressed," according to [Russian Metropolitan Hilarion](#).

February 2017

Russia identified as [Global Leader of the Religious Right](#)

November 13, 2017

Today, [Patriarch Kirill reported, the Russian Church is making huge progress in area of social work and charity; to date it has:](#)

- 4,000 church social institutions, projects and initiatives
- 400 sisterhoods of charity
- 52 shelters for pregnant women and mothers with children
- more than 100 centers for humanitarian assistance,
- more than 400 projects for disabled people
- 95 shelters for homeless people
- 500 Orthodox organizations that help drug and alcohol addicts and their relatives